

forward. At present, I should say that in many cases there are probably more safeguards in hearings before loyalty boards, than there are in hearings before congressional committees. If hearings before congressional committees were placed on a higher standard than hearings before loyalty boards, possibly that might be an inducement for the executive department also to move forward.

Mr. GORE. I agree with the Senator that we should start at home. Those who live in glass houses should not cast stones. But one wrong does not justify another. Thousands of persons are being wrongfully accused and wrongfully convicted, without having the privilege of disproving their guilt, without having an opportunity to establish their innocence, without knowing who is accusing them or of what they are being accused.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Tennessee is quite correct, and, unfortunately, this tendency has become more marked in the past 14 months. But let us move ahead in Congress to change and improve those procedures which we can most directly affect.

RECESS

Mr. WILLIAMS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 9, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 8 (legislative day of March 1), 1954:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Joseph E. Hines, of South Carolina, to be United States attorney for the western district of South Carolina, vice John C. Williams, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Maynard C. Hutchinson, of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass., to fill an existing vacancy.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Gen. John Kenneth Cannon, 3A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general, under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. John H. Cassady, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as commander-in-chief, United States Naval Forces, Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean.

Vice Adm. Thomas S. Combs, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Rear Adm. Edmund T. Wooldridge, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 8, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, at whose word of command all life was created and light first sprang out of darkness, we thank Thee for the gift of this new day.

We humbly beseech Thee that our hearts may be filled with a sense of Thy goodness and our minds illumined with that divine wisdom which will make us equal to all our tasks and responsibilities.

We penitently confess that our vision is dim, our faith is feeble and we are tempted to despair as we look and labor for a better world wherein dwelleth righteousness.

Grant that Thy peace, which passeth all understanding, may dispel those doubts and fears which so frequently haunt us and hold us in captivity.

We pray that Thou wilt give health of body and peace of soul to our stricken colleagues. Bless the doctors and nurses with faith and skill as they minister tenderly unto all who are in suffering and pain.

Hear us in the name of the great Physician. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 5, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 1, 1954:

H. R. 8069. An act to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

On March 6, 1954:

H. R. 7996. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

THE INSIDE STORY OF DEAN MANION'S DISMISSAL

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Dean Manion's outspoken support of the Bricker amendment was the official excuse or subterfuge for his dismissal. It was not the basic reason. The basic reason for Manion's dismissal was the fact that he took his job too seriously; he proposed to do a thorough job of halting the Federal Government's invasion of State, local, and private functions in the fields of taxation, power, health, housing,

education, business, industry, and agriculture, and of returning some of these functions to the States and local governments where they belong under our Constitution.

Dean Manion had laid the groundwork for a thorough job of unscrambling the concentration of powers in Washington that had taken place during the 20-year New Deal regime. He planned to present such a convincing and powerful report that the Congress would feel impelled to pass the necessary legislation to implement the report.

Dean Manion was fired not because he spent too little time on the work of the Commission—as Governor Thornton of Colorado suggested—but rather because he was determined to go further than the administration wanted to go.

Mr. Speaker, Dean Manion is one of the greatest authorities in the Nation on our Federal Constitution. He is perhaps the greatest defender of the Constitution in the United States today. He was fired because of his effectiveness, his thoroughness, because the administration did not want to go as far as Dean Manion proposed to go in the work of decentralization.

PRELIMINARY REPORT BY THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE ON HEALTH INQUIRY

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am filing today, on behalf of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a preliminary report growing out of our health inquiry which summarizes important facts about health and disease today.

Last October after the adjournment of the Congress, this committee, in the discharge of its legislative responsibilities in the field of health, initiated a broad inquiry, the first phase of which was a study of our present-day knowledge of the causes, prevention, and control of some of the major diseases of today. We were concerned specifically with finding out just what has been accomplished, what the problems are, what the immediate future holds, and what additional steps might be taken by way of research, or other measures, to hasten relief from these dreadful diseases, mitigate human suffering, and curtail the losses which disease inflicts on our national economy.

Some 95 distinguished physicians, scientists, and laymen participated in the series of panel discussions which we conducted last fall. This report summarizes the testimony received and recommendations made by these outstanding persons in the fields of heart disease, cancer, arthritis, rheumatism, poliomyelitis, tuberculosis, blindness, hearing defects,

epilepsy, cerebral palsy, muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, and mental illness.

While the health inquiry continued through the fall and into this Congress, and will result in further reports to the Congress, it has seemed to the committee that the testimony concerning these major diseases has been so significant and comprehensive that it warrants being drawn together in this preliminary report so that all may have the benefit of this knowledge. The report contains the statements and opinions of qualified persons on subjects which are close to the heart of the people and timely for the consideration now being given to our public health.

I commend the reading of the report to every Member of the Congress.

PROTECTION OF CONGRESSMEN

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving a number of letters and telegrams from various people of Louisiana dealing with the matter of bulletproof glass placed in the House and Senate Chambers for the protection of the Members of Congress. I had not paid too much attention to it until I received a letter from the Honorable James A. Noe. Mr. Noe is a very influential citizen of Louisiana, and a former governor. He is the owner of two radio stations and the largest television station in the State of Louisiana. I thought this letter was of enough interest to place in the RECORD in order that you may read it and give it some consideration.

The letter is as follows:

THE JAMES A. NOE STATIONS,
Monroe, La., March 3, 1954.

Congressman GEORGE S. LONG,
House of Representatives, House Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I heard someone say over the radio that nothing could be done to protect you Congressmen and Senators from some fanatic or crank that wanted to get up in the gallery and shoot you. I do not agree with that. I have sat in the gallery of the Senate many times and I am sure the people who come to Washington and come to the gallery of the House and Senate would not object if there was a 10-foot, bullet-proof glass put around the entire gallery of the House and Senate and, if this had been done, this awful thing could not have happened that happened, and I am writing each member of the delegation from Louisiana to see if this can be done because this awful thing might happen again and be worse the next time.

Hoping to see you soon, I am,

Most sincerely yours,

JAMES A. NOE.

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the acts of violence committed in the House last Monday by four fanatics have created a great deal of discussion as to what lies behind that criminal activity. In the first flush of excitement the press identified them as Puerto Rican Nationalists. Shortly thereafter it was revealed that two of the terrorists were involved in the international Communist conspiracy and that the Communist Party was lurking in the background of this criminal activity.

But the question is still unanswered as to what is the real purpose behind the shooting.

It has been obvious for some time that the Kremlin agents operating in Latin America have been using the cover of nationalism for their nefarious activities. A careful study of Kremlin strategy will show conclusively that its agents are associated with and taking advantage of the driving force of nationalism in every part of the free world wherever it becomes active. I wish to emphasize that this strategy is applied only to the free world. The other phase of the Kremlin strategy, which applies to the empire of captive nations over which it ruthlessly rules, is to kill off every vestige of nationalism. This appears to any reasonable person as a contradiction and more particularly a dual policy. That is precisely what it is.

The new internationalism conceived by Lenin and activated by Stalin remains as the basic doctrine and practice of the international Communist conspiracy. This new internationalism calls for the absolute destruction of all sovereign nation states and their replacement by Communist dictatorships which will be completely controlled by Moscow. This new internationalism has for its objective a world based on one economy, one language, one culture, one tradition, one ruling elite class. It also calls for one ruler—a czar of czars—who will be enthroned on the traditional seat of the czars in Moscow. The superior people of this envisioned empire will be the Muscovites—the proclaimed elite of the new world order.

This is no idle dream, nor it is a classroom theory. It is being put to practice with relentless fury in every one of the non-Russian nations controlled by Moscow. In every respect it is genocide on a scale never before known to man.

Entire nations have been destroyed for opposing it—such as the Crimean Tatars and the Kalmucks. But despite the fury of the Kremlin to destroy nationalism within its slave empire—nationalism still remains its greatest enemy and unrelenting adversary. The spirit of the national patriot is something the mad men of the Kremlin cannot destroy.

In the free world the Kremlin agents associate themselves with and seek to control the natural, healthy aspirations of nationalism. Their objective is to ride to power on the legitimate aspirations of national patriotism. But they also create a false nationalism in areas

and countries where it does not exist. They organize, finance, and direct small groups of lunatics and fanatics in order to create turmoil and confusion in the free world.

Puerto Rico is just such a case. There is really no nationalist party or movement in Puerto Rico. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House made an investigation of the so-called nationalist movement in Puerto Rico in 1951 and here is what, in summary, they found.

First. An effort was made to organize a nationalist party in Puerto Rico in the early thirties but it never gained more than 1,000 adherents.

Second. Its leading candidate for senator-at-large was only able to get 2 percent of the vote in the 1932 insular elections.

Third. The defeated candidate then organized an underground army known as the liberating army of the republic. This has a familiar ring, because Moscow has been organizing liberating armies underground for many years. The purpose of course is to liberate free people into Communist slavery.

Fourth. The propaganda line of the phony nationalist party has for years been playing up "Yankee imperialism." We know that in recent years Moscow and all its agents have been spreading false propaganda charges on "Yankee imperialism." The only imperialists left in the world are the Muscovites so they exercise their guilty conscience by making the charge against us.

Fifth. The entire record of the so-called nationalist party in Puerto Rico is one of violence, murder, and underground subversion. The tactics used are identical with those taught in the advanced institute of violence in Moscow.

Sixth. The record and performance of the so-called nationalist party in Puerto Rico is directly interwoven with that of the Communist conspiracy in the United States. The Daily Worker and the Sunday Worker—both mouthpieces of the Kremlin—have long been loud in the praise of these so-called nationalists.

This record all adds up to but one conclusion. We should stop calling the would-be assassins of last Monday nationalists and recognize them for what they really are. They are agents of the world Communist conspiracy. Whether they are witting or unwitting agents is secondary. We should also recognize that the mad men of the Kremlin continue to stoop to the use of lunatics to carry out their black operations. What the Kremlin really hopes to do is to discredit healthy nationalism because it fears that the leaders of the free world will eventually come to support and associate themselves with the forces of healthy nationalism now at work within the Moscow-controlled prison of nations, it is clear that the Kremlin will stop at nothing in order to prevent this from happening.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

**MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC.
NO. 337)**

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the report on the Mutual Security Program covering operations during the 6-month period, June 30, 1953, to December 31, 1953, in furtherance of the purpose of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended.

In this report is factual evidence of valuable progress being made through mutual efforts toward the vital goal of increased security for this Nation and all the free world.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 8, 1954.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1954

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 460 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] and yield myself such time as I may consume, and I further ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 460 makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 8127, the so-called public roads bill, intro-

duced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR]. This is an open rule, and it provides for 2 hours of general debate.

This bill is the usual public roads measure which is brought into the Congress every 2 years, except it is an enlarged bill. It goes further, perhaps, than any other measure of this type that we have considered for a great many years. The authorization for public roads for this year, for instance, if my memory serves me correctly, is \$550 or \$575 millions. This measure carries an authorization for public roads purposes of \$875 million per year for the 2 years beginning in 1955.

The McGregor bill, the measure before you, is the product of some 13 weeks of subcommittee hearings by the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the House Committee on Public Works. It carries authorization for the appropriation of \$270 million for the primary highway system, that is, the Federal aid to be matched by State funds, which is an increase of \$32,500,000 over the provisions in the present law.

The bill carries an authorization of \$180 million a year in appropriations for Federal aid for the secondary system, for the farm-to-market roads for the Nation, an increase of some \$15 million above the present authorization. Incidentally, and rather importantly, too, I might say, this measure provides that in the future the State highway departments shall have the control and final authority over the specifications for farm-to-market roads included in the secondary highway system rather than the Public Roads Administration of the Federal Government, as in the past.

This bill provides also for an interstate highway system of \$200 million, or \$175 million more than provided in the present law. This interstate system, by the way, is requested by the military authorities of the Nation and will be of great benefit to all States. Incidentally, the matching arrangement on the interstate system is a little different from the ordinary matching system in the Federal-aid-to-highways proposals in the past. Usually the matching has been on a 50-50 basis. However, this bill provides that on interstate systems under the \$200 million appropriation authorized, the matching should be on the basis of 60 percent Federal funds and 40 percent State funds. This is done, as I understand it, for the purpose of helping the lower income States in the West which have such large areas and such long road systems that must be constructed, if we are to have a national highway system worthy of the name.

The bill would authorize an appropriation of \$875 million out of an estimated income from gasoline taxes of some \$906 million. This would leave approximately \$31 million to be used for emergency purposes. I think I should point out very clearly, if I may, that the \$200 million fund authorized for construction of an interstate highway system is predicated upon the Congress continuing the one-half-cent gasoline tax, which was put on as part of the Korean war emergency effort. I have been re-

quested to point out, as it was pointed out to us in the Committee on Rules, that the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives appreciates fully that it has no authority or jurisdiction of any kind over questions as to whether or not this one-half-cent gasoline tax is to be extended. That is a matter over which only the Committee on Ways and Means has original jurisdiction. That great Committee on Ways and Means will, of course, give consideration to the question as to whether the one-half-cent gasoline tax is to be extended or is to be permitted to die. So, the Committee on Public Works has so drawn this bill that in case the Committee on Ways and Means, or the Congress itself decides not to extend the one-half-cent gasoline tax, the emergency tax which is now in existence, the interstate system and the money authorized therefor will be eliminated and will not be put into effect. Am I correct in that statement, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman please repeat that statement. I am very much interested in that part of the bill to which the gentleman from Ohio is now addressing himself concerning the gasoline-tax provision. Did the gentleman say that is going to be stricken from the bill?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No, I did not say it would be stricken from the bill. I tried to point out that the Committee on Public Works in appearing before the Committee on Rules made it very clear that the \$200 million fund for the construction of the interstate-highway system to be allocated to the States on a 60-40 percent basis was dependent upon whether the one-half-cent gasoline tax now in effect and due to expire is extended by the Congress. They made it very clear also that the Committee on Public Works did not assume, or did not attempt, to take any jurisdiction whatsoever over any tax legislation, and that this question of whether the one-half-cent gasoline tax is to be extended or permitted to expire rests entirely with the Committee on Ways and Means, and then following any action of the Committee on Ways and Means, any action that the Congress itself may take. However, as I understand it, this legislation is so drawn that if for any reason the Committee on Ways and Means or the Congress itself decides not to extend the one-half-cent emergency-gasoline tax, then this section of the bill will not apply. In other words, the funds will not be appropriated or authorized under the \$200 million interstate system plan which was set up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman any views as to the effect of this particular provision on the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think it has been made pretty clear in the hearings and so forth and so on, of the committee, and in the statements made by the committee, and those statements which I understand will be made later on in debate, so that the Committee on Appropriations will understand clearly.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not going to press the matter further with my friend because, of course, he is speaking on and presenting the rule. I was interested in that particular provision because it seems to me to be a most unusual one.

I have no recollection of any similar provision being included in any other bill for this.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In other words, if I may express my understanding of the situation to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] the Public Works Committee, being pressed by many States and by many Members of Congress for some action on this interstate system, finally agreed that they would include the authorization in the bill subject, of course, to later action by the Ways and Means Committee and the House itself. In other words, they did not feel that they should authorize a greater amount of money than would be available under the present law, if it is continued.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. This linking up of the Federal tax on gasoline and the road program is setting quite a precedent, and in view of the fact that the Manion Commission has gone thoroughly into the subject of Federal aid for roads and will have a comprehensive report upon the same, it is doubtful whether the Congress should preview this matter and disregard entirely what the Manion Commission may report and may recommend, by taking this action at this time. I feel that we are establishing a precedent that is a doubtful one. I feel that the Congress should wait at least until they get the report and the recommendations of the Manion Commission on Federal aid for roads.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] knows, when we levied this half-cent tax on gasoline, it was meant to go into the general revenue, and there was no intention that the proceeds of that tax or the continuation of that tax, which we voted the other day, should be specifically applied to roads. I agree that it would be a very bad thing to have in the law.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that the bill does not specifically tie the two together.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. That may be true, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] has just stated. But I venture to say that 90 out of every 100 people who drive up to a station for gasoline, consciously or perhaps unconsciously, think or understand that the 2 cents a gallon he has to pay for the gas that he buys is in some way connected with the roads of this country and he thinks that that

money is being expended for that purpose.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan. That is exactly the statement I was going to make. There is a strong feeling—and I am one who feels that way—that if we are to levy gasoline taxes on a Federal basis, or for that matter on a State basis, the funds derived from such special gasoline taxes ought to go where the American people think they are going and where they want them to go, on the highways of the Nation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I have had a number of people talk to me about this language and what it might mean as some sort of a perpetual Federal tax, as against a State tax. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] properly referred, of course, to the Commission's work on intergovernmental relations and what might be forthcoming. Let me say that, as far as I am concerned—and I think it is the attitude of the committee—this does not build anything in perpetuity. If in the future it is determined that the Federal Government should get out of the field of gasoline taxation and turn it back to the States, there is nothing here to prevent that being done. That is a matter for continuing study. But what is here sought to be done—and I am for it, and I think generally speaking the Members of the House will be for it—is to see to it that when this becomes effective the money that the people pay in the form of gasoline taxes shall be applied to the building of roads. That is a battle that has gone on in the States before. It went on in my State. It is still going on there. Of course, there are many other taxes, excise taxes, for instance, on automobiles and on lubricating oil and on tires that are not covered here.

Those taxes go into the general revenue to cover the general operations of the Government. But here we are dealing with a specific thing, which is the gasoline tax; and, as the gentleman from Ohio so well points out, it is a tax that the people believe is being expended in the construction of roads and that is where they want it expended.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much. I would like to point out, if I may, that the American motorist is the highest taxed individual in the world. He is being taxed in every direction for every purpose. All that the Committee on Public Works is endeavoring to do in this legislation, as I understand it, is to set up a system of distribution of Federal funds for highway aid purposes somewhat realistic to the amount of money that is being collected from the American people in the form of gas taxes, although by no means the full amount of the gasoline taxes. If that were to be done it would require new legislation. But the people who pay the tax are certainly very much interested, and that is the sort of logic that the committee is following out wisely and well. They have done everything within their power to make certain that they will not intrude upon the rights and

privileges of either the Ways and Means Committee or the Members of the House and Senate themselves.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. There have been some observations made by the chairman of the committee and also by the distinguished majority leader that would make the record appear that the 2 cents is going to be used in connection with roadbuilding. That, of course, is not so.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is correct. The money is paid into the general revenue funds as gasoline taxes, and this comes out of the general revenue funds.

Mr. McCORMACK. And if the committee were to bring out a bill providing that gasoline taxes would be used only for roads that would be a different proposition. I would agree to that.

Mr. MASON. So would I.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure we would both agree on that, but the money included in this bill comes out of the general revenue funds.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gasoline tax is paid into the general funds of the Treasury.

I think the gentleman would go a step further and say that if Congress decided that for highway purposes we were to appropriate twice or three times as much out of the general revenue funds as the gasoline taxes we would have a perfect right to do it under the present law and setup. But what the Committee on Public Works is attempting to do here, as I say, is to make a somewhat realistic allocation of highway funds for Federal-aid purposes on the basis of what is being collected in gasoline taxes and going into the revenue fund.

Mr. McCORMACK. We want the record to show that this bill does not provide that the gasoline taxes imposed, or the revenue derived from them shall be used in connection with road building.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have tried to point that out to the best of my ability. Perhaps I am not sufficiently intelligent to make it clear.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Ohio is very intelligent. I simply wanted the record to show in view of the statement made by the majority leader—

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I believe it does. Mr. McCORMACK. That this applies to the half-cent tax.

What I do not like about it—I am not saying I am opposed to it—but what I do not like about it is that this is conditional legislation and it seems to me it might fall within the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee to consider.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would suggest that we go ahead and adopt this rule and reserve our questions for a discussion of the merits of the bill later.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 26]

Abbitt	Fogarty	Moulder
Ayres	Forrester	Multer
Barrett	Gamble	O'Brien, N. Y.
Battle	Garmatz	O'Neill
Bender	Gary	Osmer
Bentley	Granahan	Patman, Tex.
Boland	Green	Patterson
Bosch	Gwinn	Philbin
Brownson	Hand	Phillips
Buckley	Hart	Powell
Byrne, Pa.	Heller	Radwan
Camp	Herlong	Rains
Canfield	Hillings	Rayburn
Celler	Holifield	Reams
Chelf	Holtzman	Reece, Tenn.
Chudoff	Hunter	Rivers
Clardy	Javits	Roberts
Cotton	Jensen	Rodino
Coudert	Kearney	Rogers, Fla.
Davis, Tenn.	King, Pa.	Roosevelt
Dawson, Ill.	Klein	Small
Dodd	Knox	Sutton
Donovan	Krueger	Taylor
Dorn, S. C.	Lantaff	Weichel
Edmondson	Latham	Wickersham
Elliott	Miller, Calif.	Widnall
Engle	Miller, N. Y.	Williams, N. J.
Fallon	Morgan	Wilson, Calif.
Fine	Morrison	Wilson, Tex.
Fino	Moss	Yates

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 337 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have permission to sit during general debate for the balance of the week on H. R. 7839.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1954

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make this statement, that so far as I can speak for the Ways and Means Committee, I do not consider that this is any impingement upon the rights of our committee. I am very much in favor of this proposal as presented in this bill.

I think it is essential, and I think the bill is very well drawn. All that the Ways and Means Committee is doing under the excise tax is simply to extend the gasoline tax as requested by the President.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means; I thank him very much for his statement.

I would like to say again that perhaps the greatest need of this Nation basically today is for better roads. Almost all of

us recognize that the highway system has deteriorated greatly throughout the Nation during the war years. The number of automobiles on the highways today is much larger than it was just a few short years ago.

Perhaps there may be some need for expanded employment in this country in the days ahead; no one knows at the present moment, but I do know that many States are taking action now to try to build better and more highways. My own State just last fall by a vote of the people authorized a bond issue of some \$500 million to be expended in the State on State highways and county roads in addition to the \$80 million a year that is spent on a regular basis. So it is necessary if we are to have good highways in this country that we continue this Federal-aid program, either that or turn the tax money back to the States.

I think the Committee on Public Works has done well in preparing this legislation. It is comprehensive legislation. Perhaps none of it is exactly the way each and every one of us would like to have it, but it is a good well-rounded bill, and it does return to the local communities and to the States for highway purposes most of the money that the people of the United States put into the general revenue fund through gasoline taxes.

I am hopeful that this rule will be adopted promptly and that we may turn to the consideration of this measure on its merits in 2 hours of general debate under an open rule. You will have an opportunity to offer any amendment you wish. I am hopeful that the rule will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in taking the floor now is not to go over too much what occurred in our committee but I just want to point out to the membership of this House what this bill proposes.

The able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], who just preceded me compared this bill to the last highway-aid bill, and told you that in the existing bill we have \$575 million appropriated for the use of highways. That is true, but I will say to my friend from Ohio that Indian roads and forest roads previously have been financed from money coming from other sources.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am not going on last year's bill; I am telling what is in this bill, \$550 million to \$575 million.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is not the fact because it also includes Indian roads and forest roads. The comparison is not equitable.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Perhaps the comparison is wrong; I do not know. But I do know that the highway bill as reported by the Public Works Committee last year carried \$550 million to \$575 million.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Five hundred and seventy-five million dollars exclusive of forest roads and Indian roads.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will permit, Public Law No. 413 of the 82d Congress provided \$247,500,000 for the primary system.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. One hundred and sixty-five million dollars for the secondary system.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. One hundred and thirty-seven million five hundred thousand dollars for primary and urban; and the interstate system \$25 million which if my arithmetic is correct adds up to \$575 million. Now, if I have been given incorrect information, I am very sorry, but that is from the public law that was passed by the last session.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am proud of the gentleman for being a great mathematician because he is 100 percent right, but in the bill before us he adds elements that are not in that bill, so it is not a fair comparison.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We do have in this bill some items that were not in the other bills; however, this bill does carry a total of \$875 million.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In that bill, and the figures the gentleman has just read do not include forest roads and Indian roads.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right. We did not have as much in that bill as we do in this one.

Mr. DEMPSEY. You had as much for forest roads and Indian roads. But we will not confuse that. The comparison is just not equitable because you cannot compare all the elements in the two propositions.

The bill that we are considering has several elements that I disapprove. We have now three categories in the allocation of funds. The first is interstate. Interstate roads are nothing else but the cream of the primary roads that the Defense Department, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the highway departments of the respective States selected as being defense roads. We made them interstate roads because of the comprehensive system we need here in the United States for defense purposes.

The interstate, the primary, and the secondary funds have always been apportioned to the States on a formula predicated upon population, area, and miles of road. The urban are on a different basis, on population alone, and you can see why that should be. It affects the cities.

Now, we have changed the formula. This bill that is before you today splits the \$200 million for interstate roads notwithstanding they are defense roads, notwithstanding they were approved by the Defense Department, in fact, recommended by that Department, and puts half of the \$200 million on a strictly population basis.

What does that do to the defense highways? Well, the great State of Texas has 2,500 miles of defense roads and on this population-basis apportionment they lose in the 2 years \$3,600,000.

There are 19 States affected here and they are all affected in the same way—they all are victims of discrimination. The State of Alabama loses \$279,000; Arizona, \$772,000; Arkansas, \$510,000; Colorado, \$1,002,000; Georgia, \$388,000; Idaho, \$507,000; Iowa, \$830,000; Kansas, \$1,278,000; Kentucky, \$59,000; Maine, \$112,000; Minnesota, \$789,000; Mississippi, \$469,000; Missouri, \$520,000; Montana, \$1,288,000; Nebraska, \$1,153,000; Nevada, \$565,000; New Mexico, \$903,000; North Carolina, \$15,000; North Dakota, \$726,000; Oklahoma, \$790,000; Oregon, \$793,000; South Carolina, \$64,000; South Dakota, \$838,000; Tennessee, \$172,000; Texas, \$1,823,000; all annually. Then there is Utah, \$424,000; Washington, \$212,000; Wisconsin, \$281,000; Wyoming, \$521,000. In the 2 years this bill covers, fiscal 1956 and 1957, all of the States I have enumerated will lose double the amounts I have just stated.

The States that I have just given you are charged with the responsibility of the care of 64 percent—about two-thirds—of the defense roads. Those with about one-third of the interstate mileage get more than all the States to which I have just called your attention. In other words, the States with one-third of that mileage are given almost 50 percent more of the Federal funds than are the States with twice as much mileage.

Now, I am not going to talk too long on this subject. We fought in the committee up and down, and the majority of my committee felt that they would split it two ways and let it go at that.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. My distinguished colleague said that the majority of the committee split it two ways. My distinguished friend from New Mexico was the only one who objected to splitting it two ways.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have not denied that; that is just what I am bragging about, if you will let me do it, because there is a principle involved here. You have changed the formula that has been in existence a great many years. Now we find that a gentleman in another part of this Capitol, in another branch of the Congress, wants to change the apportionment made to farm-to-market roads and put it on the basis of the number of automobiles owned by the respective States. We are getting away from a comprehensive system of highways and going back to something that I dislike because, after all, if in defense areas radar or something of that kind was needed, and it cost a billion dollars, I would vote for it. You do not need it in sparsely settled areas, but in sparsely settled areas is where you have your defense projects. They need roads there. I have in my State a project that is over 90 miles long and 30 miles wide. They condemned much of that land owned by ranchers because it was needed by the Federal Government, and I was happy the Government obtained it.

Now, there are several things about this bill I want to call to your attention. I promised the chairman of my com-

mittee, who introduced the bill, I would be for retaining 2-cent gasoline and diesel fuel tax. I am for it, but I believe the money should go to the construction of highways in the United States. I have been advised, not directly but indirectly, by the President of the United States through his speeches, that that is what he wants done. The majority floor leader of this honorable body is a great person. The press this morning quotes him as saying this money should be expended for roads. But, when does this bill we are now considering take effect? A year from next July, and in the meantime if we retain this extra half cent on gasoline, it earns from April to next July \$500 million. Where is that going? Is it going on roads? We should be fair. I tried to get in my committee consideration for a bill introduced a year ago last January providing for \$200 million additional for interstate highways last year and this. Now, I tried to get \$200 million more for last year and this year for this interstate system because those roads are in deplorable condition and need immediate work. There was no argument against my bill except balancing the budget. We had hearings last year, a terrific number of them, to find out what the situation was. We found that the situation was that everybody needed more and better roads. People were constantly being killed on the highways, even some murdered. Thirty-eight thousand three hundred people were killed last year, far over 300 more than the year before, and it will be more this year. That will continue until we do our job and get this money for the highways that we need.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Are there any toll roads in the gentleman's State?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Not one. We could use more money. If this bill is not going to take effect until a year from next July, then we should get something in the meantime, or else use the \$500 million that we are going to tax the people in the meantime, take it and put it where it is going to construct more and better roads.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I want to compliment the gentleman in directing the attention of the House to the disproportionate distribution of this money as it deals with the western territory, as he has previously outlined. What I would like to know is, What would be the correct answer, in the opinion of the gentleman? Should we retain it on the basis of population, area, and road miles?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Defense roads should be absolutely placed on the basis of population, area, and total miles in your State. That formula has been in effect for years and years.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Was there any other formula suggested to the committee of which the gentleman

is a member as to the manner in which this should be apportioned other than 50-50 on the basis of population and on the primary fund roads?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will say this, that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads and the gentleman from New Mexico had worked very closely together until this thing came up.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY].

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the authorization for highway purposes proposed in this bill (H. R. 8127) is not adequate. Years of neglect, much of it caused by war and defense expenditures, have left our roads dilapidated, dangerous, and inadequate from many standpoints. Further delay in attacking the problem in a bold, effective way cannot be justified. For a nation on wheels, a highly industrialized nation, to longer tolerate our highway deficiencies is inexcusable.

This Nation should be criss-crossed with broad, safe, smooth, modern highways. Even now, to bring our highways up to reasonable standards will require years of vigorous effort. Obviously further delay means drifting toward avoidable highway dangers and possible defense calamity.

Our civil defense authorities are now beginning to feel that their previous program of "duck and cover" is being made untenable by the increasing destructive power of nuclear weapons. Can anyone here imagine what would happen if our large city populations had to be quickly moved to the country? The chaos, congestion, and confusion would be a sorry and sad testimonial to our failure to build adequate highways. We would pay in lives then for our failure to spend dollars now.

We are presently reducing the size of our Army and planning to keep it, insofar as possible, here in the States, as a strategic reserve. We hope to somewhat offset the size of our Army by emphasis on mobility. This necessary mobility would be closer to actuality if we had modern highways. For instance, out in California, one inadequate trans-Sierra highway would prove a most hazardous bottleneck to movements in or out of central California, including the crowded and highly strategic bay region. Added to this overall lack of good highways must be added the inadequacy of military access roads. This was called to my attention last year by the Department of Defense.

We are in a period of increasing unemployment. There is talk of trying to reverse the trend by construction of public works. No public works could be more sensible or useful than highways to get America out of the traffic jam.

The great Hearst newspapers, in an article of March 6, written by Mr. John A. O'Brien, have estimated that this proposed program is \$1,900,000,000 short of our minimum requirement to merely start on a 10-year highway plan. Mr. O'Brien quoted President Eisenhower, where on several occasions he indicated cognizance of the need for a greatly expanded highway program. I should like

to include Mr. O'Brien's ably written article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of March 7, 1954]

ROAD BILLS FAIL TO MEET CRISIS OUTLINED BY IKE—TREASURES FALL \$1,900,000,000 SHORT OF NATION'S NEEDS

(By John H. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON, March 6.—A review of the statements of President Eisenhower on highways not only demonstrates his understanding of the Nation's congestion crisis, it also demonstrates the inadequacy of the Federal-aid highway bill supported by his administration.

The President's first statement concerning highways was printed in the Hearst newspapers of October 26, 1952, when he was a candidate for the office to which the American public elected him by a landslide vote.

The statement was a lengthy one, and in it the President showed a keen awareness of the obsolescence of our streets and roads; the congestion around cities, and, in his words, the "appalling problem of waste, death, and danger."

MILITARY VIEWS

He looked at the problem, too, with the eyes of a military man.

"More than at any time in history, modern roads are necessary to defense and traffic is an interstate problem of concern to the Federal Government."

In stating his own solution to the problem, the President spoke in general terms. He said:

"By intelligent leadership and wise planning, an integrated program can be devised within the ability of the people to pay the cost."

TAX REQUEST

A year after he took office, the President on January 7, 1954, referred to highways in his state of the Union message.

He asked that the Federal gasoline tax be kept at 2 cents "so that maximum progress can be made to overcome present inadequacies in the interstate highway system."

The tax was to be reduced automatically to 1½ cents next April 1. Congress has demonstrated its undoubted intent to retain the full tax.

Shortly thereafter, a bill written by Representative MCGREGOR, Republican, of Ohio, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Roads, was introduced calling for the annual authorization of \$875 million in Federal aid to highways.

The author of the bill said it had administration support, and this has never been questioned.

At a White House press conference a few days later, the President was asked what he thought should be the amount of Federal aid.

An aide handed him a slip of paper, and the President replied that it ought to be \$800 million. It developed in subsequent discussion that the aide had written \$825 million on the slip of paper, but that the President had cut it down by \$25 million to be on the conservative side.

It thus became apparent that the administration favored a bill authorizing somewhere between \$800 million and \$875 million, with the larger figure actually incorporated in an administration bill.

On January 28, the President submitted to Congress the Economic Report of the President, a 225-page book.

On page 104, under a subhead reading "Need for Public Works," the President wrote:

"The largest current requirement for predominantly State and local facilities is streets and roads."

CITES NEEDS

"It has been estimated that an annual expenditure of \$3½ billion would be required for 10 years to eliminate the existing backlog for federally aided systems and another one to two billion dollars for other roads and streets.

"In the meantime, many roads now adequate would need to be improved as traffic increases, or rebuilt because of normal wear, adding over \$1,500,000,000 of construction annually, while maintenance costs would average another \$1,700,000,000.

"Thus, the total annual expenditure required to provide an adequate road system within a decade is apparently over \$8 billion, which compares with a current outlay of about \$5 billion."

To meet the needs of the Federal-aid road system alone, as the President wrote, requires the annual expenditure for 10 years of \$3,500,000,000.

BILLS LAG

The administration bill calls for the spending of \$875 million, and with matching funds required from each State would bring the total to something like \$1,600,000,000.

The need: \$3,500,000,000.

The solution: \$1,600,000,000.

The gap between need and solution: \$1,900,000,000.

Thus the gap is larger than the solution.

Since all of the foregoing information comes from administration sources, it bears out the conclusion reached in the first paragraph:

That the statements demonstrate the President's awareness of the scope of the problem and the inadequacy of the administration's solution.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to point out a section of the bill which I think is surplusage under the present situation. I think on the whole the bill is a very good bill. Of course, I am for it. However, there is a provision written into this bill, on page 5, line 11, that reads as follows:

That the Secretary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1954; and the Secretary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1955.

I think I understand the reasoning behind that and the reasons for that provision's being in the bill. At the time this bill was written and adopted by the very splendid Committee on Public Works, the bill continuing that excess tax of half a cent and bringing it up to 2 cents had not been voted out by the Committee on Ways and Means. Since that time that tax has been voted out—that is, a continuation of that tax of half a cent, which gives the 2-cent tax that is mentioned here. It will be passed by this body on Wednesday.

You might argue, What difference does it make then? It makes this difference: For the first time in the history of all this Federal-aid road legislation, as I understand it, such a restriction has been placed upon these allocations.

Let us bear in mind there is nothing partisan about this. This is not partisan legislation. This is a matter that has been supported uniformly by both the Democratic and the Republican Parties when they were in power. I do not think there is anything sinister or partisan about this provision under discussion, but I am apprehensive—and others who have given thought to this matter are apprehensive—of the precedent set here when we put that in the bill. Once you write that into this bill, do not forget that it is going to continue in there from now on and will become permanent legislation.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am sure we all recognize the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi has always been fair and his honesty and integrity cannot be questioned. We are trying to do that in this legislation. We are trying to say to the traveling public in all honesty that we are going to give them the approximate amount of money that they pay in for gasoline taxes and diesel fuel. Certainly there is nothing in this legislation that makes it permanent. But we are pointing out to the other body that we want to be in a position where we can say to the States in which we have contractual obligations that we are going to live up to them as long as we have the 2 cents gasoline tax revenue. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me on that.

Mr. COLMER. Now will the gentleman from Ohio answer a question for me? If the gentleman had been assured in the premises that the one-half cent excise tax would be continued, then I would take it he would not have written this provision into the bill?

Mr. MCGREGOR. We might have had that assurance in this body, but I will say that sometimes the other body does things that we do not do here.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. MCCORMACK. What assurance is there, assuming that this bill becomes law that the Committee on Appropriations will appropriate the one-half cent that this relates to? There is no guarantee of that?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am certain that the minority whip is familiar with the rules of the House relative to authorizations which might be considered appropriations as far as roads are concerned. The Committee on Appropriations is practically bound to appropriate money called for in road authorizations because of the contractual obligations made with the various States.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Is the gentleman stating that our Government is bound by the provisions of these bills and that the Committee on Appropriations should appropriate funds which have not been authorized?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am glad to be corrected. I will say that we are morally bound because of the contractual obligations that exist with the States.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will agree when the gentleman says we are morally bound. But that is a different matter than being legally bound because if what the gentleman says is correct, then we are making an appropriation which the standing committee has no power to make.

Mr. McGREGOR. I might say to my distinguished friend, there is nothing in this bill relative to appropriations that is not in the basic Highway Act of 1944, and the gentleman from Massachusetts was here at that time and helped pass that bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. The basic act of 1944 provides for authorizations.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. The bill we are now considering makes an authorization dependent upon the existence of a tax, is that not correct?

Mr. McGREGOR. We are just being honest and saying you cannot have the cake and eat it too; if you want good roads, you must pay for them.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not impugning the honesty of my friends or of the committee. The language is very plain. I am not even saying that I am going to vote against it, but I have certain doubts about the advisability of it.

Mr. McGREGOR. May I say to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is so worried over this additional one-half cent tax that is going to be renewed, I hope, on Wednesday. If he wants to make a motion to strike out that one-half cent tax on Wednesday on a recommitment motion, that is his privilege. Then we can definitely decide whether we want good roads or bad roads.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is deeply indebted to his friend, the gentleman from Ohio, for advising him as to something he can do, which the gentleman from Massachusetts is thoroughly acquainted with and knows that he can do. But let us confine ourselves to this bill. According to what the gentleman said this amounts to an appropriation, or has the effect of an appropriation.

Mr. McGREGOR. Not any more, as my distinguished friend knows, than any other authorization bill relating to roads coming from the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. McCORMACK. My dear friend fails to differentiate. This is entirely different from an ordinary authorization, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very obvious here that under the present situation we do not need this provision in the bill. My good friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, falls back on that old relief measure, that we are going to leave this to the other body to attend to. I think sometimes we ought to do a little legislating on our own over here.

Let us go back to the merits of this proposal for just a moment. It is not going to make any practical difference if this tax is continued and if this language stays in, except for the danger of the precedent that you set for the future. Once you tie it in here with this, you are going to have it continue in the bills that follow. If that is what you are

going to do, and you collect 2 cents for the Federal Government, which amounts to more than these allocations, why not put it all on a Federal-aid basis, if you are going to match it dollar for dollar and that is your purpose? But again I would be opposed to that for the simple reason that I do not want this highway legislation tied down with this kind of restriction. Your administrative problems would be enormous.

For instance, take your fishing fleets, your agricultural tractors, and other farm implements, where they do not pay the tax. You would have an enormous administrative problem there in making these deductions. The Federal Government would have to go in and figure out the various deductions for these fishing fleets and agricultural implements, where the tax was not required.

I was in hopes—I do not have too much now—that my distinguished friend might see his way clear to eliminating this section. I am not so sure, if somebody else does not do it, in the consideration of the bill, that I shall not be constrained to offer an amendment to delete it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my remarks to the provisions of the bill which provide \$200 million of Federal matching funds for the interstate highway system.

There are a few basic facts about this system which should be recalled:

Its designation as interstate indicates that this is the system with which the Federal Government should be primarily concerned.

If another war should come, which, of course, we all pray will not happen, these are the highways which the Department of Defense says must do the job. Today they are the roads which are carrying the load. These 40,000 miles of interstate highways comprise only 1 percent of the entire road mileage in the United States yet they carry 20 percent of all the traffic.

The evidence adduced by the committee is conclusive that this system today is totally inadequate to do the job because of this high volume and heavy traffic load. This is particularly true in the highly populated areas. It is on these interstate roads in the congested sections that the movement of traffic has been reduced to a snail's pace. It is here where the highways have deteriorated—where they are too narrow and outmoded. These are the highways that were built at the beginning of the automobile era. They now need rebuilding and replacement. It is here where the great losses are incurred—in cargo delays, in driver time loss, in added gasoline and oil consumption, in wear and tear on motor vehicles and the motoring public's nervous system.

These are some of the reasons why the McGregor bill provides for the first time a substantial sum for the interstate system. It is my personal opinion that

an even greater amount of the total should be allocated to this system.

The American Association of State Highway Officials who are responsible for the roads in your State and, who on a whole know more about the road problem than any other persons in the country, have made an exhaustive study and survey with reference to the interstate system and have reached the conclusions as I have outlined them. Their study goes further and recommends what must be done to improve the interstate system. They point out that the improvement of the interstate system must be a uniform improvement throughout the entire country. It must be a uniform improvement if it is to be effective, particularly in the time of emergency. In other words, this interstate chain of roads is no stronger or effective than its weakest section.

These State highway officials have determined the approximate cost of bringing these roads up to the standard needed to meet the commercial and defense requirements of the Nation.

One of their significant findings is the fact that the cost of doing this job in the 8 most populated States is 51½ percent of the total, while the cost of all of the remaining 40 States represents 48½ percent of the total cost. Their findings further point out that in the first 8 States we find 71,500,000 of our people as against 79,200,000 in the remaining 40 States.

Then again these 8 States account for 25,700,000 motor-vehicle registrations against 27,500,000 in the remaining 40 States.

With these cogent facts before them, the State highway officials in convention assembled voted to recommend to the Congress that the money allocated for the interstate system be distributed on a population basis. The significant thing about this recommendation is the fact that 46 highway departments voted specifically for the population formula and only 2 against.

It should be further noted that each State had one vote irrespective of its size, population, or the amount contributed to the Federal Government in gasoline taxes.

It seems to me that with these facts no fair-minded person can come to a different conclusion than have our State highway officials, especially when it is known that in many instances the cost per mile of constructing these interstate highways in the industrial areas is seven times the cost in rural areas.

The McGregor bill before us provides that only one-half of the two hundred million be distributed under the population formula; that the remaining one hundred million be distributed under the old formula.

It is obvious from what I have said that if the interstate system is to be improved uniformly and the job properly done all of the two hundred million should be distributed under the population formula as the State highway officials recommend. Yet there are some who selfishly insist that we should ignore the population formula completely and distribute this entire two hundred million on the old basis. If we do this those States where the cost of improvement is 51½

percent, get only 34 $\frac{1}{10}$ percent of the funds while those States where the cost is only 48 $\frac{1}{2}$ percent get 67 $\frac{1}{10}$ of the money.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman for making a very excellent statement. It is quite evident that as a member of this great committee he has paid close attention to the testimony before the committee and made a great study of it and he is, better than that and more than that, expressing so well and for the education of all of us the solutions to the problems that confronted the committee.

Mr. SCHERER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8127, with Mr. NICHOLSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill presented to the House today is the result not of brief hearings on the part of the Committee on Public Works or its subcommittee on roads but is the result of long and extended hearings that lasted more than 3 months last year and many days this year. We think it is a good bill. There may be some provisions in it that some Members of the House and some members of the committee are not entirely satisfied with.

But, upon the whole this is a good bill and provides more money for highways than any highway-aid bill ever presented to Congress.

I think the great problem before the American people today is not how to build the best automobiles in the world, because we are doing that, but the great problem which presents itself to us in the House today is to find some means of providing adequate facilities on which to operate them. The Bureau of Public Roads informs us that we now have 55 million registered motor vehicles in our country, 1 for every 3 people in the United States. More than that, we are adding to that number about 3 million new cars annually. The industry provides about 6 million new cars every

year, while 3 million cars leave the roads each year because of time and travel; in other words, they become old, obsolete, and worn out. In the next 2 years we will have 60 million cars traveling the highways of this country. More than that, we are told that we aggregate about one-half trillion miles of travel every year. The people who own automobiles use their cars more than they did 10 years ago. They travel more miles; they go longer distances; they use the car more often, and we are burning up about 40 billion gallons of gasoline annually. I know of no people on the face of the earth who are more dependent upon their motor transportation facilities for their daily needs or when the ownership of motor vehicles have become such an important factor in the lives and welfare of the people, as here in the United States. So, I refer once more to the problem that faces this Congress and the public officials of this country, namely, to provide adequate facilities to operate the enormous number of cars that travel the highways of our land.

There has been some criticism found with one or two of the provisions. This bill provides \$225 million more in matching money than the previous bill which was passed by this Congress two years ago. It has been the policy of the Congress to pass a road bill every 2 years. This bill provides for the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. The money for the fiscal years 1954-55 has already been provided for and has been allocated to the States. Some argument has been presented that this bill ought to be set up a year sooner. I heard it discussed in the well of the House. I doubt very much, if you did that, whether the States could match it in time to take advantage of it; in other words, we have a road policy in this land that started back in 1916, a Federal-State highway system. Upon the whole that system has worked admirably for more than 35 years. Why should we change it? Why should we change it when it is time-tested and found not wanting? I think it would be a great mistake. Even the suggestion that the Federal Bureau of Roads be abolished and the Federal Government withdraw from collecting taxes on gasoline suggested by the governors' conference I think would be a tragic mistake, because you would have no coordinating agency to integrate this vast system of highways that has been built up since 1916. Why, more than 300 years ago it was discovered that "the easy conveyance of men and goods from place to place was one of the three things necessary to make a nation great and strong." Good roads manifested itself to the people of this world even 2,000 years ago. The Romans believed in good roads and they built a road that has lasted more than 2,000 years. The Greeks believed in good roads, and 300 years ago an English authority came forth and said that the easy conveyance of men and goods from place to place is one of the three essentials which make a nation great and strong. That is the subject we are dealing with today on the floor of this House, the subject of transportation.

I am not going into the question of the technical points of the bill, because, may I say to the House, in justice to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], that he has devoted much time, thought, and energy to the question of good roads. It was from his subcommittee that the bill was presented to the full committee and adopted by us unanimously.

The opposition presented here about this half-cent gas tax I think is a tempest in a teapot. Perhaps the language is unusual, but if the tax bill which will come to this floor next Wednesday had been passed before this bill came to the floor you would have heard no discussion about it and there would have been no necessity for putting the language in the bill. I am satisfied that the half-cent gas tax should be continued, and I believe it will be continued.

I am not going to take any more time at this point.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works yield me a moment in order that I may confess that there are certain provisions in this bill I do not understand? Knowing how careful and capable the gentleman is in delving into these subjects in his committee, I should like him to explain, in order that I may vote intelligently on the provisions of this bill, first, what is meant by the Federal-aid primary highway system. Is that within the States alone?

Mr. DONDERO. I trust the gentleman will defer his question because I have tried to avoid discussing such questions, leaving them to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads [Mr. MCGREGOR], which committee practically prepared this bill.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I am willing to wait if the gentleman will give me time to ask that question later.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I will first state to the committee that I am appearing as a substitute today. The absence of our distinguished colleague from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], ranking member of the Roads Subcommittee, was caused by the tragic incident that happened here last Monday. There were two members of our committee who received injury then, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS]. I am happy to report to the committee today that both Mr. FALLON and Mr. DAVIS of this committee have been able to return home and their conditions have been reported as satisfactory.

In spite of the combined efforts of the local governments, the State governments, and the Federal Government, we have not been able to settle the tremendous and urgent road problem existing in this country today. You will recall that we have 3 million miles of roads in our country. It is estimated that to put all our roads in repair and bring them up to present-day standards it would require an appropriation of from

\$35 to \$40 billions. The number of vehicles has increased far in excess of the building program that has been carried on throughout the country.

The principal section is section 1, dealing with the traditional recognized highway program, the primary, urban, secondary, or so-called farm-to-market roads. This amount of \$550 million provided under existing law has been increased to \$600 million. There has been some change in the administration of the secondary-road program. It establishes the elimination of the rigid requirements that heretofore have been required of local governments in the construction of secondary roads to meet certain criteria and certain standards and certain specifications. The provision of that part of the bill is somewhat distasteful to me. However, there still remains the right of the Secretary of Commerce to veto any standards or specifications that do not meet requirements. There has been a contention throughout the land that we need to relax those high standards which have been imposed heretofore and give the local governments more opportunity to have their say as to what type and what character of roads they should construct. I have always been of the opinion that we have a firm obligation to see that the Federal Government's tax dollars are being wisely invested, and, even though there might have been some complaints, it has served a most useful purpose.

In section 1 we also find a 25-percent interchange of funds that has been made retroactive to the act of 1952.

The most controversial section of the bill is section 2, dealing with the interstate system. The last act we passed in 1952 provided for \$25 million to be spent on the principal or main arterial highways throughout the country known as the defense highways. That road system found its life in the act of 1944. It places a limitation of 40,000 miles of roads in the interstate system. So far we have had designated 37,000 miles of the interstate system. It carries the heavy load of the traffic index figures. We are increasing the former amount to \$175 million to be made available in the fiscal year 1956-57 for the construction of the interstate system. Heretofore the interstate system has been on a 50-50 matching program, 50 percent being furnished by the Federal Government and 50 percent by the local and State governments. We have increased Federal participation to 60-40 percent. We have changed the formula of \$100 million from the traditional matching basis that we have used in the past to a population basis. The other \$100 million is to follow the same matching formula that we have had in the primary and other road systems. This represents a compromise between the urban voices and that of the rural States.

In my own State we would be most happy to have the traditional formula written, based upon the three ingredients that have been recognized historically in the writing of the roads bill. Unfortunately, we did not have sufficient strength, we did not have the urge nor the facilities to write into this bill every-

thing that would be suitable to my people or suitable to all the people in the other States. So we agreed that one-half of the total amount would be based on a population formula and the other \$100 million would be based upon the formula we have used in the past.

There is a great deal of contention about the continuation of the one-half cent gasoline tax. I assure you this is no effort on the part of the Committee on Public Works to trespass upon the sovereignty and the authority of the Committee on Ways and Means. But with an increase of \$175 million it was necessary to have some agreement and some voice of concert that we would have available in 1956 and 1957 sufficient moneys to pay for the increases made in the bill.

There is a great deal of uneasiness about this proposal. You will recall that in the discussion with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] the very question was raised as to whether or not the normal relationship existing between an authorization and an appropriation would prevail in making funds available for the construction of roads. The Committee on Appropriations has recognized that this authorization gives rise to a moral obligation that when the contracts are made between the Bureau of Public Roads and a State highway department, they could then proceed with the planning and the expenditures of local funds in obtaining rights-of-way, a condition precedent to carrying out its contractual relations.

This bill recognizes, as we have in the past, that within 2 years the State highway departments of the various States would have credits of moneys that were not used in a single year. So I do not conceive nor do I believe that this provision in the bill is as serious as the objectors find it to be.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I wanted to inquire of the gentleman whether or not he knew of any precedent in previous legislation for adopting the 60-40 matching fund basis rather than the 50-50 basis. It is the first time it has come to my attention.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The 60-40 formula is based upon several reasons, the principal one being the tremendous cost of building the interstate system. In the State of Rhode Island for example, it is estimated that on the interstate system the cost would be in excess of \$2 million a mile. To take care of 4- and 6-lane highways such as these, it is necessary that we have huge and large expenditures to construct that type of road.

Second, the ability of the State to match these funds has been most difficult for a number of States. As an inducement to the States to carry on the construction of an interstate system it was necessary, in the opinion of the committee, to provide an increase in Federal participation.

I, for one, along with several other members of the committee, would like to

have seen the formula changed to 75-25. Our views, however, did not prevail, and that too was a compromise figure.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman know whether or not we have in the past adopted such a matching basis? My only experience has been with a 50-50 basis. I am wondering if the gentleman has additional information on that.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I do not recall in a single instance when the matching ratio has been that high on the four principal categories of roads.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I have been somewhat concerned about the provision in the bill for the diversion of 25 percent from one purpose to another. Is it the intention of the committee that funds appropriated for urban roads might be diverted to rural roads or that funds appropriated for rural roads might be diverted to the building of city streets?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Not in excess of 25 percent; and that 25 percent provision was written in, in order that there should be some versatility of effort on the part of State highway departments to meet their State's needs. It is hard to anticipate this far in advance the particular needs of an individual State.

Mr. EVINS. I do not remember that flexibility in such legislation before. Funds have been appropriated for a particular purpose and they have been used for that purpose.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes; they have the 25 percent formula in existing law.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I want to say in reply to the distinguished gentleman from New York that the act of 1941 carried a different formula than the 50-50 matching provision.

Mr. Chairman, I also wish to take advantage of this opportunity to extend my thanks and appreciation to the gentleman from Alabama for the distinguished service and assistance he has given us on this bill and legislation.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 27 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works, and the author of the bill before us.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to pay my respects not only to the Subcommittee on Roads but also to the full Committee on Public Works. They have worked hard and diligently. This is a bill that came out of our committee by a unanimous vote. There was no politics; we considered all of the areas which it is our privilege to represent; and, as so ably stated by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, this is a compromise measure. There are many things in the bill that, possibly, if I were writing it for the 17th Congressional District of Ohio or for the State of Ohio, I would have changed to coincide with the Ohio viewpoint; but all of us in representing our respective

districts and States recognized this as a national matter and thus agreed on a compromise bill which we all accepted. I want to say to the members of the committee that I certainly appreciate the splendid cooperation they have given me.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to read a statement which was presented to me by one of our colleagues on the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS]; and I also ask, Mr. Chairman, that after this statement our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Roads, be granted permission to insert his remarks ahead of those of the gentleman from Ohio. Both of these gentlemen are confined to the hospital for reason known to all of us.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. This is a statement of the gentleman from Tennessee:

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Public Works, I rise to support House Resolution 8127. This measure is necessary and should be enacted into law to provide Federal-aid authorizations for orderly continuation of the highway construction program for an additional 2-year period. The amounts authorized by this bill will become available to the States during the fiscal years 1956 and 1957, on a matching basis.

The Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works conducted a complete study of the highway problem, as well as the needs for a new construction and numerous other factors all relating to highways. As a result of the factual material furnished to the committee by Federal department representatives, State highway officials, road builders, automobile associations, truckers, the motorist, and many persons in private industry as well as others, we were convinced that the highway problem was one which demanded top priority.

We were informed that \$800 million was the minimum annual Federal-aid authorization which would be required to accomplish most urgently needed construction work and that such a program would have to be kept in effect for at least 20 years to keep pace with the problems.

I believe the committee in reporting favorably on H. R. 8127 is attempting to be realistic, consistent with the economy of the Nation, and is meeting head on the challenge which the highway problem presents.

In authorizing \$800 million for Federal aid to highways for each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957, we have increased the amount authorized in the 1952 act by \$225 million per fiscal year.

I believe the provision in section 1 of the bill, which permits up to 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for primary, secondary, and urban systems, respectively, to be transferred from one system to either of the others, is a progressive measure and allows greater latitude in administering the funds which will accomplish better results on a more satisfactory basis. This same observation may be made with respect to the second proviso in section 1, for that will also assure more perfect cooperation between the States and the Bureau of Public Roads with respect to secondary roads, and should prove mutually advantageous.

The committee should be commended for the constructive action which it has taken in this bill with respect to two vital and somewhat controversial measures. In section 9, it has directed the Secretary of Commerce to make a study in cooperation with the State highway departments and other parties in interest relative to the problems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruction of public utilities services resulting from authorized highway improvements. Among other things, such a study is to include a review and financial analysis of existing relationships between the State highway departments and affected utilities of all types, and a review of the various State statutes regulating existing relationships, to the end that a full and informative report may be made to the President for transmittal to the Congress of the United States not later than February 1, 1955.

In section 12 the committee has given recognition to the need for a great highway to traverse the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf and has authorized the expenditure of \$250,000 from general administrative funds to expedite the planning and coordination of this Great River Road.

The purposes and objectives of this legislation are reasonable and urgently required. These authorizations are needed not only as part of the national defense program but also the national highway safety program.

I earnestly and sincerely support this bill and respectfully urge its passage.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege and a pleasure for me to incorporate in the RECORD at this point the statement of the Honorable CLIFFORD DAVIS, a member of our subcommittee and the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. Chairman, for the first time in history, the bill before you, H. R. 8127 authorizes appropriations for Federal-aid highways and for highway work in the national forests, national parks and parkways, and Indian reservations in the approximate amount of the Federal road user tax on motor fuels. The total of \$875 million authorizations carried in the bill compares with the approximately \$905 million collected by the Federal Government on gasoline and diesel fuel in the fiscal year 1953.

There are several important features in the bill which I shall describe more in detail in a moment. These are:

First. Provision for a greatly enlarged authorization for the improvement of the national system of interstate highways.

Second. Provision for the transfer of funds between different categories to provide a flexibility necessary to meet highway needs which vary from State to State.

Third. The transfer to the State highway departments of much greater authority to handle the local problems involved in the farm-to-market road program.

The bill provides for carrying forward the time-proven pattern of cooperation between the Federal Government operating through the Bureau of Public Roads and the several States operating through their respective State highway departments with a few changes which experience has indicated are desirable.

The bill would authorize \$600 million for each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957, divided among the three categories of projects established initially in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, as follows:

Two hundred and seventy million dollars, or 45 percent, for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

One hundred and eighty million dollars, or 30 percent, for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

One hundred and fifty million dollars, or 25 percent, for projects on the Federal-aid primary system in urban areas.

An additional \$200 million annually is authorized for improvements on the interstate system. This system, which was set up through cooperative effort of the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads under the direction of Congress, is limited to 40,000 miles. It represents the most important highways in the primary system. It is important not only to our peacetime economy but is vital to our national defense, consisting as it does of highways of the greatest strategic importance. The rural portions of this system, although comprising only slightly more than 1 percent of all the highways in the country, carry 20 percent or more of all the rural traffic. It has been well said that this system, together with other important mileage, is an integral part of our industrial assembly line. It provides an indispensable service.

The approximate amounts which each State would receive from the \$800 million authorized are shown in the table which I submit for the RECORD:

Approximate apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds pursuant to H. R. 8127

State	Federal-aid				Interstate			Total (\$800,000,000)
	Primary (\$270,000,000)	Secondary (\$180,000,000)	Urban (\$150,000,000)	Subtotal (\$600,000,000)	Population ¹ (\$100,000,000)	Sec. 21 ² (\$100,000,000)	Subtotal (\$200,000,000)	
Alabama.....	\$5,761,000	\$4,465,000	\$1,938,000	\$12,164,000	\$1,876,000	\$2,155,000	\$4,031,000	\$16,195,000
Arizona.....	4,038,000	2,750,000	575,000	7,363,000	735,000	1,507,000	2,242,000	9,605,000
Arkansas.....	4,495,000	3,597,000	827,000	8,919,000	1,170,000	1,680,000	2,850,000	11,769,000
California.....	12,393,000	6,381,000	13,148,000	31,922,000	6,487,000	4,652,000	11,139,000	43,061,000
Colorado.....	4,858,000	3,245,000	1,229,000	9,332,000	812,000	1,814,000	2,626,000	11,958,000
Connecticut.....	1,751,000	882,000	2,864,000	5,497,000	1,230,000	658,000	1,888,000	7,385,000
Delaware.....	1,323,000	882,000	303,000	2,508,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	3,733,000
Florida.....	4,386,000	2,867,000	2,652,000	9,905,000	1,698,000	1,643,000	3,341,000	13,246,000
Georgia.....	6,682,000	5,103,000	2,156,000	13,941,000	2,111,000	2,499,000	4,610,000	18,551,000

¹ Apportioned according to total population with minimum of $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 percent.

² Apportioned according to sec. 21 of Federal Highway Act— $\frac{1}{4}$ area, $\frac{1}{2}$ total population, and $\frac{1}{4}$ post road mileage, with minimum of $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1 percent.

Approximate apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds pursuant to H. R. 8127—Continued

State	Federal-aid				Interstate			Total (\$800,000,000)
	Primary (\$270,000,000)	Secondary (\$180,000,000)	Urban (\$150,000,000)	Subtotal (\$600,000,000)	Population (\$100,000,000)	Sec. 21 (\$100,000,000)	Subtotal (\$200,000,000)	
Idaho.....	\$3,328,000	\$2,341,000	\$285,000	\$5,954,000	\$735,000	\$1,242,000	\$1,977,000	\$7,931,000
Illinois.....	10,401,000	5,664,000	10,344,000	26,409,000	5,339,000	3,901,000	9,240,000	35,649,000
Indiana.....	6,409,000	4,418,000	3,538,000	14,365,000	2,411,000	2,399,000	4,810,000	19,175,000
Iowa.....	6,520,000	4,772,000	1,756,000	13,048,000	1,606,000	2,436,000	4,042,000	17,090,000
Kansas.....	6,552,000	4,587,000	1,390,000	12,529,000	1,168,000	2,446,000	3,614,000	16,143,000
Kentucky.....	4,977,000	4,131,000	1,536,000	10,644,000	1,804,000	1,863,000	3,667,000	14,311,000
Louisiana.....	4,207,000	3,045,000	2,168,000	9,420,000	1,644,000	1,576,000	3,220,000	12,640,000
Maine.....	2,265,000	1,621,000	618,000	4,504,000	735,000	847,000	1,582,000	6,086,000
Maryland.....	2,374,000	1,451,000	2,510,000	6,335,000	1,436,000	892,000	2,328,000	8,663,000
Massachusetts.....	3,429,000	1,273,000	6,156,000	10,858,000	2,874,000	1,293,000	4,167,000	15,025,000
Michigan.....	8,379,000	5,113,000	6,884,000	20,376,000	3,904,000	3,141,000	7,045,000	27,421,000
Minnesota.....	7,002,000	4,943,000	2,408,000	14,353,000	1,828,000	2,617,000	4,445,000	18,798,000
Mississippi.....	4,826,000	4,021,000	819,000	9,666,000	1,335,000	1,804,000	3,139,000	12,805,000
Missouri.....	7,870,000	5,325,000	3,643,000	16,838,000	2,423,000	2,943,000	5,366,000	22,204,000
Montana.....	5,423,000	3,730,000	348,000	9,501,000	735,000	2,023,000	2,758,000	12,259,000
Nebraska.....	5,264,000	3,733,000	868,000	9,865,000	812,000	1,965,000	2,777,000	12,642,000
Nevada.....	3,486,000	2,330,000	113,000	5,929,000	735,000	1,300,000	2,035,000	7,964,000
New Hampshire.....	1,323,000	882,000	438,000	2,643,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	3,868,000
New Jersey.....	3,491,000	1,175,000	6,475,000	11,141,000	2,963,000	1,316,000	4,279,000	15,420,000
New Mexico.....	4,389,000	3,015,000	485,000	7,889,000	735,000	1,638,000	2,373,000	10,262,000
New York.....	12,691,000	5,085,000	19,770,000	37,546,000	9,087,000	4,775,000	13,862,000	51,408,000
North Carolina.....	6,690,000	5,715,000	1,901,000	14,306,000	2,489,000	2,504,000	4,993,000	19,299,000
North Dakota.....	3,917,000	2,844,000	250,000	7,011,000	735,000	1,461,000	2,196,000	9,207,000
Ohio.....	9,415,000	5,727,000	8,559,000	23,701,000	4,869,000	3,531,000	8,400,000	32,101,000
Oklahoma.....	5,778,000	4,137,000	1,616,000	11,531,000	1,369,000	2,159,000	3,528,000	15,059,000
Oregon.....	4,616,000	3,226,000	1,186,000	9,028,000	932,000	1,725,000	2,657,000	11,685,000
Pennsylvania.....	10,597,000	6,306,000	11,197,000	28,100,000	6,433,000	3,980,000	10,413,000	38,513,000
Rhode Island.....	1,323,000	882,000	1,057,000	3,262,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	4,487,000
South Carolina.....	3,635,000	3,010,000	1,017,000	7,662,000	1,297,000	1,361,000	2,658,000	10,320,000
South Dakota.....	4,217,000	3,012,000	287,000	7,516,000	735,000	1,573,000	2,308,000	9,824,000
Tennessee.....	5,851,000	4,560,000	2,139,000	12,550,000	2,017,000	2,189,000	4,206,000	16,756,000
Texas.....	17,513,000	11,727,000	7,086,000	36,326,000	4,725,000	6,548,000	11,273,000	47,599,000
Utah.....	3,104,000	2,053,000	627,000	5,784,000	735,000	1,159,000	1,894,000	7,678,000
Vermont.....	1,323,000	882,000	230,000	2,435,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	3,660,000
Virginia.....	5,128,000	3,986,000	2,306,000	11,420,000	2,034,000	1,920,000	3,954,000	15,374,000
Washington.....	4,463,000	2,982,000	2,232,000	9,677,000	1,458,000	1,670,000	3,128,000	12,805,000
West Virginia.....	2,944,000	2,563,000	963,000	6,470,000	1,229,000	1,103,000	2,332,000	8,802,000
Wisconsin.....	6,378,000	4,450,000	2,896,000	13,724,000	2,105,000	2,386,000	4,491,000	18,215,000
Wyoming.....	3,367,000	2,282,000	161,000	5,810,000	735,000	1,256,000	1,991,000	7,801,000
Hawaii.....	1,323,000	882,000	497,000	2,702,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	2,702,000
District of Columbia.....	1,323,000	882,000	1,278,000	3,483,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	4,708,000
Puerto Rico.....	1,402,000	1,465,000	1,271,000	4,138,000	735,000	490,000	1,225,000	4,138,000

No one can dispute the urgent need for modernizing our highway system. Testimony submitted to the committee by the State highway officials indicated that the estimated cost of eliminating the deficiencies on the approved Federal-aid systems of 673,000 miles amounted to approximately \$35 billion. This estimate is larger than similar estimates made in prior years. The increase in the estimated cost of modernizing this mileage shows that under our present rate of expenditure we have been losing ground. This has happened in spite of an expenditure of \$3,600,000,000 on the Federal-aid systems in the past few years.

A look at the increase in automobile registrations will help to explain this situation. Ten years ago, in 1944, 30,479,000 motor vehicles were registered. The number of motor vehicles using our highways has steadily increased at such an unprecedented rate that in the year just closed more than 55 million motor vehicles were in service. This is an increase in a 10-year period of 80 percent.

These statistics, however, do not tell the full story. Many owners of automobiles are using them more and more each year for both recreation and daily activities. We are truly a nation on wheels. Over night our whole population could be moved from one place to another with less than an average of three persons per car—that is, it could if we had the highways to accommodate our motor vehicles.

Now a word of explanation as to the new features in the bill which experience has indicated are desirable. The \$600 million authorized for work on the three categories of projects—primary, secondary, and urban, which might be referred

to as the regular Federal-aid highway program—is apportioned in the same manner among the States as provided in the 1944 act. To provide greater flexibility in the use of these funds to meet varying conditions encountered in different States, there is provision in the bill that would permit the transfer between these 3 classes of projects to the extent of not more than 25 percent when such transfer is requested by a State highway department and approved by the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest.

Such a provision has been recommended by the State highway officials several times in the past in connection with consideration of previous legislation, and the committee is now convinced that such a provision is necessary to provide the flexibility necessary for a State highway department to make the most beneficial use of Federal funds apportioned to it in meeting its particular highway needs.

Another provision would give to the State highway departments much greater authority in handling their secondary road program. Following the apportionment of the secondary funds to the States and the programming of projects, the State highway departments would carry on the secondary program without the necessity of referring the plans to the Bureau of Public Roads for approval and without detail inspection by engineers of the Bureau of Public Roads as is required by the present law. Payment of the Federal share of the cost of secondary projects would be made on certification by the State highway department that the plans, design, and construction of

such projects were in accord with the standards and procedures applicable to such projects which had previously been approved and following a final inspection by the Bureau engineers to see that the work had been performed.

This provision is intended to place back in the States the handling of the local problems involved in the building of farm-to-market roads and would relieve the Bureau of Public Roads of many administrative and engineering responsibilities imposed by present law. It is my belief that this provision will provide a pattern of cooperation between the State highway departments and counties, or other local units, comparable to that which has been built up through the years and which would continue between the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway departments on the primary and urban systems. This desirable transfer of authority to the State highway departments will in no way affect the requirement that the States or counties maintain the projects after construction. This maintenance requirement will insure the protection of the Federal interest in these projects and the public of continuing satisfactory highway service through proper maintenance.

The committee gave the most serious consideration to the apportionment formula for the \$200 million authorized for the interstate system. The State highway officials association had repeatedly recommended that these funds be apportioned on the basis of population rather than the formula for primary roads which gives equal weight to the three factors of population, area, and

mileage of post roads. To provide a larger apportionment to States with sparse population, a floor of three-fourths of 1 percent was recommended as a part of the population formula. The reason for apportioning these funds on a population basis, which was stressed before the committee, was that it would permit reasonably uniform progress in removing the deficiencies from the interstate system in all of the States. After extended consideration, the committee decided to provide that one-half the funds authorized for the interstate system be apportioned on the traditional primary formula and one-half on population with a floor of three-fourths of 1 percent. This is a good compromise because testimony before the committee indicated that the cost of removing the deficiencies on the interstate system are about equally divided between urban and rural areas and one-half the interstate funds would be apportioned under the bill on a formula similar to that covering the apportionment of urban funds and the remaining half in the same manner as primary funds.

Another departure from current practice is a provision which would make the Federal share of the cost of improving the interstate system 60 percent and the States' share 40 percent, with the sliding scale applying in the public land States. Strong support was presented to the committee for increasing the Federal share above the traditional 50-50 matching ratio because of the vital importance of this system to the Nation as a whole. The State Highway Officials Association and the American Automobile Association each recommended that the Federal share be increased to 75 percent. Other witnesses appearing before the committee thought that the regular 50-50 matching should be continued. Recognizing the great importance of the interstate system and the importance of expediting its modernization and that a larger Federal share would serve as an inducement to proceed more rapidly with the costly improvements on the interstate system, the committee included the 60-40 matching provision.

The apportionment and availability of the interstate funds is conditioned on the continuation of the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax. A reduction of one-half cent in this tax would reduce the income from this source by an amount in excess of the \$200,000,000 being provided for the interstate system. To make this program self-supporting from the motor fuel tax revenue it is necessary that this tax be retained at 2 cents per gallon.

The bill also provides for continuation of present programs of highway work in Federal reservations for each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957 as follows:

Forest highways.....	\$22,500,000
Forest development roads and trails.....	22,500,000
National park roads.....	10,000,000
Parkways.....	10,000,000
Indian reservation roads.....	10,000,000
Total.....	75,000,000

Because of the great lag between appropriations and authorizations for forest highways, the bill proposes to cancel the authorization of \$22,500,000

authorized for the fiscal year 1955. Such a cancellation will still leave nearly \$21 million authorized but not appropriated. There is precedent for such cancellation action since a similar situation of lagging appropriations existed when the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948 was under consideration and the authorization for 1948 was canceled.

No new authorization is contained in H. R. 8127 for continuing work on the Inter-American Highway and the so-called Rama Road in Nicaragua. However, on recommendation of the Department of State the unappropriated balances of the funds heretofore authorized to be appropriated for such purposes are continued for the fiscal years 1955 and 1956. This will provide for continuing this work at an acceptable rate.

A number of witnesses appeared before the committee urging that the cost of adjusting public utilities in connection with the construction of Federal-aid projects be made reimbursable from Federal funds regardless of current State laws and franchise provisions. The committee recognizes that assumption of the costs involved in making adjustments necessitated by highway projects imposes a serious burden on many utilities, particularly the smaller ones. The committee concluded, however, that before recommending such a step it should have the benefit of a factual study including a review and financial analysis of existing relationships between the State highway departments and affected utilities of all types and so has directed the Secretary of Commerce to make such a study in cooperation with the State highway departments and other parties and interests relative to the problems posed by the necessary relocation and reconstruction of public utilities resulting from Federal-aid highway improvements.

Under present legislation there is no specific provision for the improvement of extensions of the secondary system in urban areas. To correct this situation section 11 provides for Federal participation in the improvement of such extensions with urban funds. This is a very desirable provision. In my opinion it might be well also to permit the improvement of such extensions with primary funds.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to use not to exceed \$250,000 from General Administrative funds for the purpose of expediting the planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road which would traverse the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. Such Mississippi Valley Parkway has been proposed in accordance with the plan recommended in the joint report submitted to Congress November 28, 1951, by the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior. The committee feels that such authorization would provide an incentive to the 10 States bordering the Mississippi toward the developing of such parkway in line with established Federal-aid procedures. During recent years the committee has had before it numerous bills to provide Federal authorizations and assistance toward this project.

In concluding my description of the bill I wish to reemphasize that for the first time in history, through the enactment of H. R. 8127, we will be making available for highway work approximately the amount of the Federal tax on motor fuels.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I want to ask the question that I propounded of the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee as to the meaning or significance of the words "private highway" system. Does that include the roads within each respective State?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I may say that the gentleman's inference is correct. The primary highway system is a network of principal highways comprising the Federal-aid primary-highway systems in the States. Since World War II, 45 percent of each year's authorization has gone to this particular system.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Is the percentage allocated this year on a par or is it the same as the pattern we have followed every year previously?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct. The bill makes no change whatsoever in the primary, urban, and secondary systems; 45 percent goes to the primary, 30 percent goes to the secondary, and 25 percent to the urban.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. It is noted here that \$150 million is for projects on Federal-aid and primary highways in urban areas and \$200 million is set aside for interstate roads concerning urban areas. Why is not the \$200 million tied in with the \$150 million?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I might say that under the interstate system we have 40,000 miles, and that 40,000 miles comprises primarily urban and, I expect, a little secondary. But the 40,000 miles is the main routes of arterial travel from one section of the country to the other, and that is really under the category of a military road. We have allocated \$200 million for the interstate system. We have changed the formula on that. Instead of a 50-50 matching clause, which is applicable to the primary, secondary, and urban on the interstate system, we call it 60-40, which is 60 percent put up by the Federal Government and 40 percent put up by the States. We do that to add a little incentive for the States to hurry the so-called interstate system, because it is a part of our defense program. This defense program is quite mobile, and I feel that the interstate system is more of a Federal responsibility than it is a State responsibility.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I thank the distinguished gentleman of the subcommittee for the information he gave me. Then the sum total of these figures would be \$800 million?

Mr. MCGREGOR. The matching money is \$800 million. The actual total of the bill proper is \$875 million. The \$75 million represents forest highways, parks, and so forth.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. All of this is to be allocated to the improvement and construction of new roads; am I correct?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct. If I may interrupt the gentleman, this \$875 million is the highest amount of money ever allocated or authorized by the Federal Government for roads. The actual return from the 2-cent fuel gas tax this year is approximately \$906 million. We are authorizing \$875 million of this amount. We are leaving approximately \$30 million as a cushion fund for an emergency that might arise.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I just want to add to what I have heretofore stated, that I am sure the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is familiar with the statement the President of the United States made recently before the National Safety Council. He described the maiming and the slaughter of thousands of individuals killed on the highways, and the loss of property. My only regret, Mr. Chairman, is that the figure just mentioned is not four times as big as that which this bill calls for. I think it is one of the most worthy, one of the most outstanding, one of the most necessary causes to which we can contribute our funds that has ever been conjured up since I have been in this House.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, because I know of his intense interest in this problem. I might say that on page 2615 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you will find the apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds as it compares with existing law as to each of the segments of the highway program.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. One of the subjects discussed on the floor during the consideration of the rule on this bill was the question of linkage between the tax on gasoline and the amount appropriated. Now, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he is an advocate of linkage between the proceeds of the gas tax and the appropriations.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I might say to my distinguished friend from Iowa that there is really no linkage in this particular bill. We are saying to the people, "If you want good highways, you give us the money that you have been paying in, the 2-cent gas tax, and we will assure you by the passage of this legislation that we will put approximately the same amount of money on roads." Now, being absolutely honest and sincere, we are saying "you can either have good roads or you can vote out the one-half cent liquid fuel tax and not have them." We have no jurisdiction over the continuation of the half-cent tax, and I was highly pleased when the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Congressman REED, made the statement that we were not interfering with operation of his committee. It is imperative that the 2-cent gas tax be continued and not be permitted to expire for the revenue therefrom will bring in approximately \$910 million. With this fund available, we can assure you that you will have \$875 million spent on roads. We are not linking it. The revenue from gas and diesel oil all goes into the gen-

eral fund of the Treasury. Ninety percent of the American people believe that the gas taxes which they pay are all going into roads.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Is it fair to say to people who inquire of me that this is not a linkage bill?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I would say to my friend from Iowa, in my opinion, it is not entirely a linkage bill. If it were a direct linkage bill we would be interfering with the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, or at least that question could be raised. There has been a great debate here on whether or not we should continue the one-half cent tax. You will have an opportunity to vote on that Wednesday—for it is part of the tax bill.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is in connection with the tax bill?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is right. It is in the tax bill, I am told. If they want to argue whether or not we should continue the tax bill, that is the time to debate it. We are saying here, if you do continue the tax, we will give approximately that amount of money to the road program. If you do not continue it, we cannot, because we just have so much money. This one-half cent represents approximately \$225 million. We cannot enter into contractual obligations with the various States and then have that \$225 million taken from us.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I may say to the gentleman that as a member of the Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations this subject of Federal aid to highways has been one of the subjects which is under current consideration.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I recognize the gentleman is a member of that Commission and doing a splendid job.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The Commission is presently having under consideration a special report with reference to Federal aid for highways. That was in the background of my thinking in asking these questions.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Please remember that this is not permanent legislation. The Congress can change its mind. But one thing we are doing, we are saying to the other body that when this piece of legislation goes over there they cannot do what some of us think they want to do, which is to take out the half-cent tax and still have good roads.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman should also point out that that half cent brings in about \$225 million a year. If that half cent is not continued, it means the income from that gas tax is that much less. In this bill we are increasing the amount to the States \$225 million. It makes a spread of \$450 million.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The gentleman's figures are correct.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. NELSON. Do I correctly understand that the gentleman from Ohio means to say that the Committee on

Public Works confines itself in making appropriations for public roads solely to the revenue received from the gas tax?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Indeed not. We are not changing the existing tax law. If we were, we would say that it would be earmarked specifically for interstate roads. In no place in this legislation are we saying that we are earmarking any funds. It all goes into the General Treasury. But we are saying that we cannot give you good roads and then allow you to take one-half cent of the gasoline tax away from us.

Mr. NELSON. The gentleman's committee has made an appropriation of some \$200 million for interstate highways. I understand from the address of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], when he spoke on the rule, that the committee considers it a primary responsibility of the Federal Government to develop the interstate highway system.

Mr. MCGREGOR. We do consider the interstate system more of a Federal responsibility because of its military value and its possible expensive and rigid specifications?

Mr. NELSON. Yet, in this bill you appropriate \$600 million for intrastate highways without any limitation, but you place an express limitation on interstate highways that the money shall not be apportioned or spent unless the gas tax continues at 2 cents.

Mr. MCGREGOR. We have not changed the formula in the primary, secondary, or urban systems.

Mr. NELSON. I am talking about your limitation upon interstate highways. You have an express limitation that the money shall not be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce unless the gas tax continues at 2 cents.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Again I say to my friend, we are just saying truthfully, if we do not have the money, we cannot build the roads.

Mr. NELSON. I have gathered from the debate, and I have listened to it very carefully, the primary purpose of the linkage between the \$200 million and the 2-cent gas tax is to get the excise tax through the other body; is that correct?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I would not think so. The other body can do as they please with the excise-tax bill. If my friend wants to take off the one-half cent, he will have that privilege next Wednesday by making such a motion.

Mr. NELSON. Your friend has no desire to take off the one-half-cent tax, but he does oppose the linkage of the one-half-cent gasoline tax to the development of the interstate highways.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Would my friend then want us to be in the position of entering into a contract or an obligation with a State thinking that we were going to get approximately \$910 million of revenue, and then the other body deciding that we were only going to get approximately \$700 million? We would then be faced with the problem of canceling our obligations.

Mr. NELSON. No; the gentleman is objecting to the linkage of the tax in connection with the development of our highways. I think the development of our highways is the responsibility of the

Federal Government, regardless of the income from the gasoline taxes.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think it is the responsibility of the States and the Federal Government, but I also think it is our responsibility to be honest and fair with the road users and see to it that the money they are paying for gas tax goes on the roads.

Mr. NELSON. Does not the gentleman consider that this limitation on the expenditure of \$200 million is in effect an announcement that your committee does not consider that the Government has any responsibility for interstate highways unless and only as long as it collects the gasoline tax?

Mr. MCGREGOR. No; the gentleman is entirely wrong. I am certain that the gentleman has not read the hearings. We had weeks and weeks of hearings on this. Certainly, we tried to be fair and not infringe upon the Committee on Ways and Means, as the chairman so stated a few moments ago.

Mr. NELSON. I have no doubt about that at all.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman from Maine, in his colloquy with my colleague who is addressing us from the well of the House, has said numerous times that your committee has made appropriations for highway purposes. Now, to keep the record straight, is it not true that what your committee has done is to authorize this expenditure, but it has made no appropriations? I just would like to have the record straight on that.

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct. We cannot initiate an appropriation bill, we can only authorize. As you readily recall, the Committee on Appropriations took out \$55 million of our authorization bill for 1954.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman on the fine statement he is making, and to commend him also for the provision in the bill with respect to forest highways. I note the bill provides for an authorization of \$22½ million for forest highways. As the gentleman knows, we are extremely interested in that subject. I assume that we can count on the gentleman's support when that authorization bill or rather appropriation bill comes up.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Certainly, and I recognize the gentleman's interest in forest highways as well as in the rest of the highway program, he has discussed the problem with me many times.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I think the gentleman from Ohio has done a very fine job in presenting this bill. I congratulate him and I congratulate the members of his committee for the excellent work that they have done. However, I do have a few questions. If I understood the gentleman correctly, the bill which we are now considering does not change previous law going back to, let us say,

1948, 1947, or 1946 except that you have increased the amounts. But the allocation or the formula remains the same.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Yes, with the exception of the interstate system, which we put on a 60-40 basis.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes. But, as I understood the gentleman, no money has ever been earmarked in the Federal Treasury for the use of the highways, and this bill does not earmark any money; is that not correct?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Then, under this bill a certain amount is authorized, which is larger than any other previous bill in history or in recent years, and once we pass this bill and that money is authorized, it will be the obligation of the Federal Government whether the Federal gas tax is reduced or not; is that not correct?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct, except on the interstate system.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Therefore, there would be no direct relationship between this bill and the retaining of the present 2-cent per-gallon tax?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I do not think that is true.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And that is the wording of this bill as of now, is it not?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. May I say one more word? Then, in the event that the Congress should see fit to reduce the Federal gasoline tax from 2 cents to 1½ cents a gallon sometime in the future, the next bill that comes from this committee would have to take that into consideration; but in no way would it affect the legislation now pending before us.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The question then would be for the Congress to decide upon the amount of money it would authorize.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. At some future date.

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is right.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It would be the obligation of the Congress to find the money for this purpose, even if it had to go into the Federal Treasury and take money out that had been acquired from the highway user under some other tax, such as the tax on tires or tubes, or new automobiles, or automobile parts; am I correct?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think the language is very clear on that.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Referring to section 9, am I to infer from reading that section, that there is support in the committee for a policy of permitting the use of these Federal funds in the relocating and reconstruction of public utilities?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think the gentleman is right in the assumption that there is support in the committee, because many members of the committee feel that there is a problem relating to utilities. Some of the members wanted to earmark 4 percent or 5 percent of the fund for that specific purpose, but we

decided that a study should be made first to determine various States rights.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If I may ask one other question, at the present time none of these Federal funds may be used for such relocation or reconstruction or to assume any part of the cost of operating a public utility; is that right?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct—except condemnation on private property.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I should like to call attention of the membership to the secondary-road problem. We have heard that the governors and various other State officials want more control. On page 3 you will find a clause which gives to the State highway departments the right to draw plans and specifications and construct secondary roads to meet the needs in a particular area. There we are doing away with the practice of having to adhere to rigid Federal specifications, which are more costly than the type of road in certain areas requires.

There was reference a few moments ago that upon recommendation, the States may take the initiative, and permit a transfer from one fund to the other, of 25 percent. That is made flexible so that if the States have more money in the primary fund than they need and are short in the urban fund, they can transfer from primary to urban; or vice versa, the exception being the interstate system.

I should like to say a word on the matter of the population basis. You have heard arguments here this afternoon to the effect that the formula for the interstate roads should be on a basis of population alone. You have heard arguments to the effect that it should be based on the old formula alone. We had \$200 million. Along with other members of the committee I agreed that in order to be fair we should divide the \$200 million; take \$100 million, or 50 percent, to be spent on the basis of population, and the other \$100 million distributed according to the old formula, that is, one-third, one-third, and one-third.

That was the compromise, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that this Committee stays with that compromise. There are arguments that could be made on both sides.

I wish we had money enough to give every rural Representative all the money that he wanted and to give every urban Representative all the money that he wanted. But we do not have it. So this is a compromise, and I hope the Committee will go along with it.

This is not a perfect bill. There are some things in it that some of us do not like. But we have spent weeks and weeks on this proposed legislation, and I hope the Committee will join with every member of our committee in endeavoring to keep the bill intact, as it is written, and then send it over the other body for consideration.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WATTS].

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Chairman, in discussing H. R. 8127, the Federal Aid Road Act for the fiscal years of 1956 and 1957, I am sure that every member of the committee shares with me a feeling of gratification that we are authorizing the appropriation and spending of Federal money on projects to improve our own country. Good roads have contributed much to the expansion and growth of this country. They have added much to the health, happiness, and welfare of our people and have made possible to a large extent our economic expansion and the great wealth of material things that we all enjoy.

The great trouble has been and now is that we have not and are not even in this bill expending as much as we should and certainly not enough to have and enjoy a system of roads such as we all want and should have.

Money spent on the improvement, education, and welfare of our own people never seems to be enough to accomplish our objectives and our needs. Yet every dollar that we spend in these fields is returned to us and to future generations many times over. While H. R. 8127 authorizes more money to be spent on our Federal-aid roads than has ever been authorized before, and while being a step in the right direction, it by no means meets the need. It has been accurately estimated that as of November 1953, 63.8 percent of our roads on the Federal-aid system are now below safe standards for such roads and that expenditures of about thirty-five billions would have to be made to bring them up to the standard of safety that is needed. This same report or estimate shows that we are not even keeping even with our road-building program—that 2 years ago it would have required thirty-two billions to put our roads in good condition, whereas today it would take at least thirty-five billions. We are falling behind in spite of the large sums we are spending on our highways.

H. R. 8127 authorizes the spending of \$800 million in each of the years of 1956 and 1957 on our primary, secondary, urban, and interstate systems of roads as against the sum of \$575 million for fiscal years 1954 and 1955.

While our committee recognized that this is not as much money as could be beneficially spent, the majority of the committee felt that under all the circumstances with which our country is faced today that it was about as much as we could afford to spend.

The committee held extensive hearings in the spring of 1953 on national highway problems and gained much information that has been a real help in framing this piece of legislation. We held adequate hearings immediately prior to the introduction of H. R. 8127 as a clean bill. In our hearings we quickly discovered that all categories of our roads needed more money. More money was needed on the primary system, on the secondary system, and on the urban system. This bill provides more money on all of those systems on a percentage division among the States. That is basic law and has worked very well for a number of years.

It was almost the unanimous opinion of all witnesses that appeared before us and the opinion of the committee that the greatest need was for a rapid development of the Federal system of interstate roads. This system of over 38,000 miles comprises the main arterial highways of our country. They were selected by the highway departments of the various States. They are the main defense roads of our country. They carry the bulk of our interstate traffic. While representing only about 1 percent of our roads, 20 percent of our travel and traffic is over them. These roads run through both the rural and urban sections of our country and are parts of our primary and urban systems. The committee authorized \$200 billion for this system for each of the years covered by this legislation. We further provided that on this system of roads, which in reality is a primary obligation of the Federal Government, that the Federal Government should provide 60 percent of the cost of construction and reconstruction of same and that the States should provide 40 percent, making allowances in addition to those States that have large public landholdings within their borders. By this change in matching formula I feel that these things will be accomplished; mainly, first, it will accelerate the building of this system of roads; second, it will allow the construction, particularly in large cities, of many costly improvements that have long been delayed due to their high construction cost; third, it will help many States who are or will be hard pressed to match Federal funds on road construction.

The committee adopted a new formula for the distribution of the interstate funds among the several States. Many members of the committee wanted the sum distributed on the old formula—one-third on population, one-third on area, one-third on miles of rural and star-route roads. Many others wanted the funds provided solely on a population basis. Neither group got exactly what it wanted, but a large majority on the committee finally determined that the fair and proper thing to do was to distribute the funds on a divided basis—that is, one-half or \$100 million should be divided among the States on the old formula, and the remaining one-half, or \$100 million, should be divided on a population basis with the provision that out of the fund divided on a population basis no State should receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of that fund. While this was not satisfactory to all members of the committee, I for one who come from a State that would be benefited by the entire sum being divided on the old formula feel that on the evidence before our committee and all other things considered that the action of the committee and the terms of the bill as it is before you was, and are, fair.

The committee made several other changes in the present highway law that were thought to be beneficial and needed in the legislation.

First. The bill provides that as to the funds for the primary, secondary, and urban systems that upon the request of the highway department of a respective

State and with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce 25 percent of any of these funds could be transferred to any one or more of the other funds, but at the same time limiting the amount that any such fund could be increased to 25 percent.

Second. The bill further provides that this same arrangement shall apply to any funds heretofore authorized. This change in the law will be very beneficial in that it recognizes that different States have different problems, that in some States more money may be needed on a particular system, whereas in other States the reverse may be true. At least, it allows each State to evaluate its own problems and shift some of the funds so as to better meet those problems.

Third. A further change effected by the bill deals with the construction of secondary roads. Under present law the construction of secondary roads on the Federal-aid system are all required to fit or be up to more or less a rigid standard with little leeway for deviation therefrom. This legislation somewhat relaxes that rigid standard and provides that the highway departments of the different States may submit overall plans for design and construction of such roads subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce; and when such plans have been approved, the Secretary may discharge his responsibility as to individual projects in a State by receiving a certification from the highway department of that State that the plans for the project conform to the standards approved for that State. This change recognizes the need for different types and kinds of construction on secondary roads in the different States and recognizes differences in different parts of the same State. It vests more authority and latitude in the various highway departments in dealing with problems in their States.

With the exception of the changes above noted, H. R. 8127 generally conforms to former highway bills except that a continuation of the 2-cent gas tax is made necessary by the language of the bill if the \$200 million provided for the interstate system is to be made available to the States and further provides for a study by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with the State highway departments and other interested parties of the problems posed by the relocation and reconstruction of public utilities services for highway improvement.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATTS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I first want to compliment my distinguished colleague on the excellent statement he is now making. What are the requirements in connection with the secondary road system; I mean does the State road commissioner have more latitude under this authorization bill than in the previous bill?

Mr. WATTS. I may say to the gentleman that under existing law the Federal Bureau of Public Roads adopted pretty much a rigid standard and required that all States construct their secondary roads in accordance with that

standard. We have attempted in this legislation to relax this standard so that now all the highway department has to do is go before the Bureau of Public Roads and present a standard that fits that State—that will work good in that State—and if the Bureau of Public Roads feels that standard is adequate it will approve the overall plans for that State. The Secretary of Commerce or the Bureau of Public Roads may then discharge its obligation so far as the secondary roads are concerned by receiving from the highway departments of the various States a certification that the plans and specifications on the individual projects conform to the overall plans and specifications that have been heretofore approved for that State by the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. PERKINS. Let us assume that we are back home in Kentucky for just a few moments. In the area that I represent in eastern Kentucky it is impractical in many instances to obtain a 60-foot right-of-way due to the narrowness of valleys.

Under the present law, as I understand, you cannot get matching funds from the Federal Government unless you obtain that 60-foot right-of-way. Now, let us assume that we have acquired a right-of-way up some narrow valley of only 30 feet. Would it be possible to receive matching funds for the 30-foot right-of-way for the purpose of constructing an 18-foot roadbed from the Federal Government?

Mr. WATTS. I cannot tell the gentleman that the Federal Bureau of Roads or the Department of Commerce would approve a plan along that line, but I will say that the language as written in this bill makes it possible for the approval of a road of that kind, whereas the old language did not.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, this proposal to amend the Federal Aid Road Act by revising the formula for the allocation of Federal funds and giving the States more responsibility for the proper expenditure of these funds is of primary importance to the country at this time.

The current economic conditions have reduced the amount of State funds available for matching purposes and at the same time caused widespread unemployment. This authorization for an appropriation approximately equal to the receipts from the Federal gasoline tax is fully justified as this tax comes from the same source as that of the major portion of the State highway funds. The practice of diverting a portion of the proceeds from the Federal gasoline tax to uses other than highway construction must be stopped. The increased construction costs make it more than necessary that every possible source of funds for the construction of an adequate national highway system be fully utilized.

Modern highways must be built to sustain the heavy traffic of interstate truck-

ing with secondary roads adequate to carry this heavy traffic to every section of the country. This interstate traffic is one of the major items that has increased the cost of building a good State system of highways. This increased cost is definitely a proper charge against the Federal Government. It is impossible to make an exact breakdown of the cost to be charged to the Federal program, but this ratio of 60-40 is more reasonable in the light of current conditions than is the old ratio of 50-50. In fact, I would gladly go along with the ratio originally proposed in this bill of 3 to 1.

The liberalization, as I understand, of the requirements for secondary roads in particular is also a progressive step. The long history of Federal-State cooperation in highway building clearly indicates that the Federal Government need not be so strict as to sometimes appear unreasonable in order to assure that the State highway departments will make proper use of these funds. There will always be some need of Federal standards but that does not mean that the Federal highway engineers be required to follow in detail every action taken by the State highway departments.

The delegation of responsibility to the State highway departments, which are fully responsible to the people for their actions, will do much to expedite both the Federal and State highway programs. The current rise of unemployment makes it more urgent that our road-building program be expanded at the earliest possible date.

I know that all the Members in this body are concerned about our inadequate highway system. The lack of both water and highway transportation has retarded industrial development in the area that I represent in eastern Kentucky.

I deeply regret that the committee has seen fit to postpone the effective date of this authorization bill until July of 1955. I am hopeful that more consideration will be given to our secondary-road system. In many rural areas school children are now forced to walk several miles to school, and at times, wade the creek.

I have always doubted the wisdom in denying matching funds to certain rural areas because local governments are not able to comply with rigid standards and specifications of the Federal Government. In many instances it is now impractical to meet the Federal requirement of a 60-foot right-of-way for the construction of rural roads due to the narrowness of the valleys.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, it is rather confusing to me to be told that we are going to spend all this money collected by way of gasoline tax. I am going to vote for a continuation of 2 cents Federal gasoline tax, but it is disturbing to me to know that as of April 1 of this year there is not one cent of money you are talking about appropriating today in this bill that any of the States will get before a year from next July. That is

when it becomes effective. We are now spending for Federal-aid roads a total of \$575 million a year. We are collecting, or have collected last year, more than \$900 million, and the increase is at the rate of between 5 and 7 percent annually. So, from April 1954 to July 1955 there will be collected by the Federal Treasury approximately \$500 million more than will be used on the highway system. By the time that this \$800 million Federal aid will be used in fiscal years 1956-57 the take by the Federal Treasury from the taxpayers of this country will be running about \$1.1 billion a year at least.

I tried to get a bill through that would amend the Federal-aid highway law now in effect by adding \$200 million a year for the interstate roads. We are told by every speaker that they are defense roads, so selected by the Defense Department, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the highway departments of the respective States.

You would think by the allocation of some of these funds on a population basis that the amount of roads in the respective States had nothing to do with it. The 29 States that are going to take a beating on this bill on this population basis have 23,342 miles out of the 37,000 miles in this interstate system, and there are 13,616 miles in what is known as the area of population. That is the situation. I am getting rather tired of talking so much about this bill.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I want to ask the gentleman two questions, and he has touched on both of them. Under the Federal excise tax of 2 cents a gallon, is all of that income from gasoline confined to highway construction or does the Federal Government use any part of it for any other service?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The funds are commingled with the general fund and we get whatever the roads committee recommends and is approved by the House, when the bill is signed by the President. We are using about \$575 million out of more than \$900 million that was collected last year.

Mr. WIER. The gasoline tax is diverted to other expenditures?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is and always has been, and it is going to be under this bill.

Mr. WIER. That is what I understand.

The next question I want to ask the gentleman from New Mexico is this: In the gentleman's first presentation under the rule he used the figure that the State of Minnesota would lose approximately \$800,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Seven hundred and eighty-nine thousand dollars a year.

Mr. WIER. I have heard this new formula used quite often here. Will the gentleman explain why it is that Minnesota loses \$800,000-odd as the result of this new formula?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Under the old formula, which was based on population, area, and miles of road, out of \$100 million the State of Minnesota received

\$2,617,000. Under the population formula you will receive \$1,828,000. That is where you lose.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Under the existing law, the State of Minnesota gets \$13,744,000, and under the bill that is before us for consideration the State of Minnesota gets \$18,798,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. May I say to the chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee that the gentleman did not ask me how much they would be entitled to with these additional funds, he asked what they were going to lose because of the change in formula.

Mr. WIER. If the gentleman will yield, that is a different picture. I was assuming that the State of Minnesota, under this new formula of population, would have been \$800,000 shorter than they would have been under the old formula or the present formula.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Is the gentleman referring to the present formula of one-third, one-third, and one-third?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is the present formula.

Mr. WIER. Yes; I am referring to the difference between what we will get under the new formula and what we would get under the old formula.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I hope the gentleman will recognize and give consideration to what he is getting under the new bill regardless of the taxes and what he would be getting under the old law. It is approximately \$5 million.

Mr. WIER. I do recognize that the State of Minnesota will get considerably more.

Mr. DEMPSEY. So will every other State.

Mr. WIER. I think that is due to the fact that more money is being appropriated.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is right. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, under the old formula, we had four categories. We have the urban, the secondary, the primary, and the interstate systems. The primary system apportionment was on a three-way basis of population, area, and mileage. The interstate system was on that basis. The secondary system was on that basis, and is now, but the urban system was not. That was recognized as a population proposition, and is on a population basis. I pleaded with the committee, both with the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee, to put in any amount that they wanted for the urban system if the cities were hard hit and needed more money, and told them that I would support that. But here we have just put in a new system, a new category in 1952 that they have been trying to get in since 1944. It was never possible because of the fear of what would happen, and it has happened. Right now, in the other body, one of the Members has gone further than this, and in his bill he wants to put the secondary road system on a population basis predicated upon the

number of cars licensed in the respective States. Have you ever heard of such a thing as that? Farm-to-market roads, if you please, put on the basis of the number of cars owned in the respective States. I am perfectly amazed that anybody from the State of Michigan would support such a theory or philosophy, because, after all, we look to the State of Michigan to give us or sell us more cars. We are getting the best cars in the world, and we certainly are using them as much as we can. But I am afraid that, notwithstanding Henry Ford and some of the other people who have put America on wheels, that with the unjust taxes we are now collecting and have been collecting we are going to take a lot of our people off wheels.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman explain why the Secretary of Commerce is given discretionary power over the distribution of the funds?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because that, too, was discussed at very great length. I was happy to find that the respective highway departments in the States could have some say as to what they should put in the secondary roads. I think a standard should be set up so that proper roads will be constructed. But the language in this bill is improper. It says he may do such and such in connection with this responsibility. It does not say he will do so. He could tell the State of West Virginia, "You can go ahead." Then he could tell the State of Iowa, "No; you cannot go ahead." There is nothing in this bill which makes it mandatory upon the Secretary of Commerce to give each State the same treatment. If he says "No," that is no, and you cannot do it; but if he says "Yes," then you can do it. I have never seen legislation of that kind brought up on the floor of this House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Unfortunately, I did not hear all of the gentleman's remarks. Does the gentleman say that this bill gives discretionary power to the Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; let me read that part of the bill to you.

Mr. GROSS. That road aid was to be apportioned on the basis of cars owned?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No, no; that is not stated in this bill. The question asked me by the gentleman from West Virginia had to do with the Secretary of Commerce permitting different States to have money on the secondary road system and giving some States more liberal treatment than others. In other words, they can provide what they want and he may approve it. But I want to read to you the language in this bill. It states:

The Secretary of Commerce may discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects upon his receipt and approval of a certified statement by the State highway departments setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with

the standards and procedures of the respective States applicable to projects in this category approved by him.

He may do it. I think it should have said that he shall do it. Then we would be somewhere.

I will tell the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] another thing. We have been talking about who is getting this money. I will tell the gentleman how much he is going to lose in his State. Eight hundred and thirty thousand dollars in what the State of Iowa is going to lose.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the able gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Could the gentleman give the figures on North Carolina?

Mr. DEMPSEY. North Carolina loses \$15,000 a year.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Does California gain or lose under this formula?

Mr. DEMPSEY. California loses in number of tourists but it gains in dollars. The State of California gets approximately \$1,800,000 more; it may be more than that. But every State north of California or every State around California—Oregon, Washington, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, Idaho—gets less. I think California would prefer to have good roads coming into the State, because they represent the big source for tourists in America. That is, California is the largest area for tourists in America. Florida comes next. Despite the great citrus fruit crop in California, the greatest dollar crop is the tourists who come to California. That is the great cash crop in California.

Mr. ENGLE. Will the gentleman yield further for a comment?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman is eminently correct. We want good roads leading into California.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman is not going to get them on this basis.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. How does Arizona come out on this basis?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Not very well. Arizona loses \$1,544,000. I had a letter on this from your representative in the other body.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am sure the gentleman wants to get the figures right for the record. On the basis in the bill, California would get \$9,255,000, and on a basis of population it would get \$12,974,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have the figures right here. California would gain about \$1,835,000 each year. But every State

around California would lose. I think the State of California is more concerned about the roads leading into it, which would bring the tourists into California, because California itself has done a very good job with its roads, perhaps the best of any State in the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. This is not a question of what a State loses under this formula, is it?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; it is a question of what the national defense loses. These are national defense roads.

Mr. SCHERER. Is it not a fact that the figures that I quoted in my remarks on the rule are correct; namely, that the improvement in the 8 States will cost 51½ percent of the total and that if the money is divided as you say it should be, they will get only 32.4 percent, while the States—

Mr. DEMPSEY. I heard the gentleman's speech and did not interrupt him when he made it, notwithstanding I thought his philosophy was somewhat wrong. But that is the gentleman's opinion to which he has a right.

Mr. SCHERER. Will the gentleman permit me to finish my statement? Is it not a fact that all the State highway officials agree with my philosophy, including the officials of the gentleman's own State?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; they did not. They voted against it.

Mr. SCHERER. In the gentleman's State?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; and also in the State of Arizona. Both of those States voted against it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I just want to correct the record. Our distinguished friend from New Mexico has left an erroneous impression, I am sure quite unintentionally, but just let us get down to the facts: California under the basic section 21 specifications that the gentleman from New Mexico is advocating, would get \$9,255,000; and under population would get \$12,974,000.

Texas under basic 21 would get \$13,030,000; and under population \$9,450,000.

Illinois under basic 21 would get \$7,763,000; and under population \$10,677,000.

Ohio under basic 21 would get \$7,026,000; and under population \$9,738,000, in round figures.

Michigan under basic 21 would get \$6,250,000; under population \$7,809,000.

Pennsylvania under basic No. 21, advocated by the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, would get \$7,920,000; under population, \$12,866,000.

New York under the recommendation of the gentleman from New Mexico would get \$9,501,000; and under population, \$18,174,000.

New Jersey under basic No. 21 would get \$2,618,000; and on a population basis would get \$5,926,000.

I repeat that we attempted to make a compromise between the rural and the city areas.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The State of New Jersey which the gentleman just mentioned has 192 miles of the interstate system. The State of New York has 1,034 miles.

As I remember, the State of Pennsylvania has 1,300 miles.

The State of Texas has 2,700 miles not put on her by the State of Texas but put on her by the Defense Department for defense roads and you cut them down.

Mr. MCGREGOR. That was O. K.'d by the Highway Department of Texas.

Mr. DEMPSEY. But it was not O. K.'d by the people of Texas.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The highway department O. K.'d it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That may be.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, just before coming to the floor of the House I obtained from the National Safety Council a report on the number of automobile accidents which occurred in the United States in calendar year 1953.

The National Safety Council places the number of automobile accidents for 1953 at 9,500,000. In these accidents, the National Safety Council says, there were 1,350,000 people injured and 33,300 killed. In addition to that the National Safety Council says that the property losses and the expenses incurred through medical and hospital services as a result of these accidents totalled \$3,950,000,000.

This great number of deaths according to Mr. James Cope, vice president of the Chrysler Corp., who testified before the Public Works Committee as a representative of the Automobile Manufacturers' Association, were to a great extent preventable. He stated that the Nation's best traffic authorities estimated that 2 in every 5 traffic deaths automatically would have been avoided if present highway deficiencies did not exist.

Thus, according to the Nation's best traffic experts, the lives of about 13,000 traffic victims would have been saved had the Nation, last year, possessed adequate highways. The main justification for proving the increased highways building sums which this bill would authorize is that the additional money will provide safer highways to save lives, to lessen the number of persons being injured, and to decrease the economic and financial losses which occur as the result of unnecessary accidents that result from the inadequacies of our present highways.

President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message, urged that the present 2-cent-a-gallon Federal gasoline tax

be kept in effect after April 1, 1954, when it is due to expire. In return for keeping the 2-cent-a-gallon Federal tax in effect, the President promised an expanded highway program.

This bill provides for that expanded-highway program. It fulfills the President's promise.

President Eisenhower in his state of the Union speech in January said:

To protect the vital interest of every citizen in a safe and adequate highway system, the Federal Government is continuing its central role in the Federal-aid highway program. So that maximum progress can be made to overcome present inadequacies in the interstate highway system, we must continue the Federal gasoline tax at 2 cents per gallon. This will require cancellation of the one-half-cent decrease which otherwise will become effective April 1, and will maintain revenues so that an expanded highway program can be undertaken.

During the past 2 years, the Federal Government, under existing legislation, provided the States with \$575 million a year in Federal matching funds. This bill increases the amount of these matching funds to \$800 million, or in short, increases them by \$225 million.

In addition to this \$800 million there is \$75 million in this bill for other types of highways, forest highways, parkways, and so forth. The total amount of money in this bill for highways is \$875 million.

During the past year, the Federal Government collected \$906 million from its 2-cent-a-gallon tax on liquid fuels, gasoline and diesel oil. The new bill, therefore, gives back to the States for highway purposes nearly all of the money derived from the Federal 2-cent gasoline tax. This, in my opinion, is sound policy. Federal gasoline taxes should not be diverted to other purposes than road building.

Gasoline taxes are paid by a special class of our citizens—the American motorists. These taxes are paid by the motorist largely in proportion to the number of miles he drives and therefore, in essence are based on the extent to which a motorist uses the highways. What the motorist pays in gasoline taxes should be used by both the Federal Government and the States to building more, better, and safer highways.

These gasoline-tax revenues should not be diverted to foreign aid or to any other purposes.

MUST PAY FOR ROADS

All of the evidence submitted before our Public Works Committee, which sponsors this bill, indicated that American highways are wearing out much faster than old ones have been repaired or replaced or new ones built. This evidence was to the effect that \$35 billion will be required to place our American highways in A-1 condition.

Whether money is spent to build these needed highways or not taxpayers will pay for them just the same.

If the highways the Nation desperately needs are built, the motorists must pay for them in taxes. If the highways are not built the motorist will pay for them just the same in increased wear and tear on his car and tires, in costlier repair

ills, in higher medical and hospital expenses and in higher automobile insurance rates.

In the long run the motorists will be better off paying a 2-cent gasoline tax provided that the revenue derived from this tax is expended on more, better and safer highways.

In the long run it is cheaper to build good highways now than not to build them.

INCREASE IN CARS

In the past 20 years, the number of motor vehicles, automobiles, buses and trucks, using our American highways have more than doubled.

In 1931, there were only 25.8 million motor vehicles licensed in this country. By 1952, this number had doubled and stood at 53.3 million.

Between 1931 and 1952, the number of motor buses licensed and using American highways increased fivefold, from 42,000 to 240,000.

The number of motor trucks using our highways in 1931 was 3.5 million. In 1952 there were 9.2 million, nearly 3 times as many as in 1931.

The number of pleasure automobiles licensed in the United States increased from 22.3 million in 1931 to 43.8 million in 1952.

The number of motor vehicles using the highways is still increasing and will continue to increase.

The population of the Nation which in 1900 was less than 75 million by 1950 had doubled and stood at more than 150 million. There is every reason to believe that, barring a war of extermination, that our Nation's population will double again in the last half of the century and stand at about 300 million by 2000 A. D.

If the population doubles, the number of motor vehicles in use, it may be expected, also will double. The Nation, probably, will have 100 million instead of the present 53 million motor vehicles on its highways within 50 years. Our highway problem is not finished. It is just beginning.

In building more, better, and safer highways we build not alone for the present but also for the future.

HOW PACIFIC COAST FARES

My constituents will be interested in knowing how the three Pacific Coast States of Oregon, Washington, and California will benefit from this bill.

I have obtained from Commissioner F. V. du Pont, of the Federal Bureau of Roads, how much each of these three States will share in the increased funds in this bill.

Washington during each of the past 2 years has received \$9,148,000 a year in Federal highway matching funds. Under this bill, Washington State will be allocated, Commissioner du Pont informs me, \$12,805,000 a year for each of the next 2 years. This will be an increase of \$3,657,000 a year for Washington State for each of the next 2 years.

Oregon during the past 2 years has received \$8,502,000 a year in Federal highway matching funds. Under this bill, Oregon will be allocated \$11,685,000 a year for each of the next 2 years. This will be an increase for Oregon of \$3,183,-

000 a year over the amount now being received.

California during the past 2 years has been receiving \$29,912,000 a year in Federal highway matching funds. Under this bill, California will be allocated \$43,061,000 a year during each of the next 2 years. This will be an increase of \$13,049,000 a year for California.

Altogether, the 3 Pacific coast States will receive about \$20 million a year or \$40 million during the next 2 years more than these 3 States received in Federal matching funds during the past 2 years.

Under this bill, most of this Federal money must be matched on a 50-50 basis by the States. This means that during the next 2 years there will be \$80 million more spent on the highways of these 3 States than in the past 2 years. This additional \$80 million, on top of the millions already being expended, will do wonders toward improving the highways of the Pacific coast by making them wider, better, and safer.

TO HELP MANY INDUSTRIES

The bill carries a total of \$300 million more in Federal matching funds for the 48 States and Territories than any previous highway bill.

Most of these Federal funds must be matched by the States on a 50-50 basis. This means that the additional \$300 million of Federal money will stimulate a \$600 million increase in the Nation's highway building program during each of the next 2 years—will increase that highway building program by more than a billion dollars during the next 2 years.

Such an increase in the highway building program means the creation of jobs for tens of thousands of additional construction workers.

Also, this vast expansion of the national highway program means the creation of an enormous increased demand for cement, asphalt, steel, lumber, plywood, and all of those other materials that go into highway and bridge construction. This will bring into being tens of thousands of additional jobs for those who work to produce building and construction materials.

The railroads, truck and other transportation companies, also, will benefit through the increased freight this expanded road program will generate.

While the bill is not perfect in every detail, it is the best highway bill ever presented to Congress. I am proud to have, as a member of the House Public Works Committee, participated in writing it. I hope it will have the support of all Members of the House.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is on the whole a very good highway bill, one that has the bipartisan endorsement of the Committee on Public Works, one that will go a long way toward meeting the highway problems that we have in this country of ours. The main complaint I have against the bill is that the sum authorized is still entirely inadequate to meet the highway needs of the Nation on a year-to-year basis. I do not believe that we should ever allow ourselves to

get into a position in regard to Federal appropriations for highways of saying: We will only appropriate so much money as we get in the way of a Federal gasoline tax.

With respect to that idea, it is well to call the attention of the Members of the House who have listened to the debate as to how distribution of the interstate highway system money will be applied, because we have had a serious effort made in the past few years to do away entirely with the Federal gasoline tax and to do away entirely with the Federal system of highway aid. I would like to call the attention of those of us who represent some of the so-called poor States that if that system is done away with we will be left out in the cold entirely. I think the compromise that has been worked out in regard to the interstate system in this bill is reasonable and equitable.

I call your attention to the fact that the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] comes from a State that would benefit greatly if the interstate funds were allocated purely on the basis of population. I happen to come from a State that would benefit if the allocation was purely on the basis of the old formula. I believe, however, that in the compromise that has been worked out, where equal attention is given to both of these factors, we have reached a solution that is best for all of us concerned. If those of us from the so-called poorer States, from the large and sparsely settled States, succeeded in writing into the law a provision that ignores the needs of the highly populated States, we are liable to wake up 2 years from now and find that we get no Federal highway aid.

As has been pointed out on the floor here before, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is studying this problem now. Under the former Chairman of that Commission, I think it is very likely that we would have come through with a recommendation to do away with the Federal aid to highways system. I hope the Commission will not come through with that recommendation. If it does not, the reason will be in good part due to the fine work done by the Subcommittee on Highways of our committee under the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR]. A very thorough study of this entire problem was made at great length last year, with hearings that took more than 13 weeks. It was the considered opinion of most of those who testified at that time that the Federal-aid system should be continued.

I fully realize the problems of these urban areas; that these highly populated areas must be fully considered and some attempt be made to resolve these problems in this legislation as is proposed in the portion of the bill that gives distribution of these funds in half of the interstate system on the basis of population. I think it is a fair and reasonable proposition as presented to us today, and I hope that the House will go along with this attempt that the committee has made to arrive at a meeting of the minds in the committee that will,

so far as is possible for it to do so, meet the needs of the entire country. We are not legislating here today to solve the highway problem of Mississippi, Ohio, or any other individual State. We are attempting to help and work out a national highway system that will, insofar as possible, meet the basic needs of this country.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, the bill you have before you today is the work of several months of investigation by the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works. I believe they have given to you a comprehensive, well-rounded piece of legislation for your consideration.

There are a few matters that have not been touched upon during the course of the discussion, and I would like to give you a few figures that seem rather important to me. While this bill is not one of linkage, nor do we by this bill endeavor to appropriate all moneys that are collected in the form of gas tax, there is a relationship, because most of us feel that the ordinary motorist, when he drives up to a gas station to purchase gasoline, does that with a feeling that the tax that he is paying is being used for the construction and maintenance of highways throughout our entire country.

In 1952 there was collected in gas tax \$866,221,000. The highway users contributed \$800,755,000. The nonusers of the highways paid in gas tax that year \$65,466,000. We had complaints come to us from the airplane companies that they were paying a gas tax and, therefore, their portion of the tax should not be used for highways. The same type of complaint came from farmers, who said that the gas tax on tractors and other implements used on the farm should not be used for highways. We also had similar complaints from the motorboat owners.

I made some research and I found that this coming year we expect to collect about \$910 million. It is estimated that 91 percent of the tax will be paid by the highway users, in other words \$878,100,000 of the money to be paid in through this tax will be paid by the highway users. The amount set forth in this bill is quite a coincidence in that we are asking in the bill for \$875 million, so there is a spread of only a little over \$3 million in favor of the general fund left from the taxes paid by the users of the highways. It seems to me that should satisfy everyone when it comes to an equal distribution of the taxes paid.

I feel that another very important factor in this bill is that we have turned over to the various States the responsibility of constructing, maintaining, and writing the specifications for secondary roads. It was pointed out that the administrative cost of the Federal Bureau of Roads would be reduced by 50 percent if the secondary roads were handled entirely and directly by the State departments of highways. I think that is a very good argument in favor of this bill.

Another thing that you from the rural areas will be interested in is that this bill provides that the Federal Govern-

ment may use urban money for the construction of secondary highways through the small municipalities. You are aware that the urban moneys go only to cities of 5,000 and more, so the smaller cities are left without any funds to assist them in building the trunklines through their small municipalities. This bill will assist them. The Highway Commission may appropriate urban moneys for the construction of highways through the small cities.

I feel that this is a very fine, well worked out bill, and urge your support of it in toto.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, we face two national crises—rising unemployment, which, if not checked, will bring us into a major depression; and a woefully inadequate highway system.

I maintain these two crises in the same breath, because a solution for one is a solution for both. Members of this body who drive to and from Washington, no matter in what direction they leave the Capital, must be painfully aware of the poor condition of our highways.

The one good stretch of highway—the 18 miles of the Shirley Highway in Virginia—is rapidly becoming a death trap. Scarcely a week goes by that we do not pick up our morning newspaper and read of a serious accident.

When I drive to my home in East St. Louis, I travel over roads that are battered from the pounding of traffic. For long stretches they are narrow, and I am forced to crawl behind trucks or risk my life trying to pass. Quaint little Frederick bogs me down with congested streets; Cumberland slows me with interminable stop signs; Wheeling brings me almost to a crawl with steep hills, sharp turns, and a bridge more than 100 years old; the route takes me through the heavily congested areas of Columbus and Indianapolis.

My route takes me over an important artery, an artery over which flows the lifeblood of our economy; a route over which important military traffic must pass in time of war or national emergency. To me, the delays and the bumps mean only an inconvenience, and a month off the life of my car. As I experience these delays, however, I ask myself what they mean to the logistic snowball of military support. How many hours or days delay in a vital air strike results from 5 minutes loss by a truckload of electronic gear in Cumberland or Wheeling or Columbus?

Mr. Chairman, we in the Congress can take a long step toward solving the highway crisis. We may do it without deficit financing. All we need do is to recognize that an adequate interstate highway system is a Federal responsibility. Within a period of no more than 10 years we can build our interstate highway system up to par. We can do it without going into debt. The financing of such a program can be achieved by devoting all the money collected from gasoline and other taxes on highway users to the highway program.

That would provide about a billion and a half dollars a year to be spent on the

highway system. States could continue to do the actual work, under Bureau of Public Roads supervision. But the States would not be required to match the funds. This would free state and ordinary Federal-aid funds for work on our rural highways and on streets over which interstate traffic rarely passes.

Now how would this meet the unemployment crisis? In the first place, it would provide jobs. The program would not be boondoggling, for we would be building to increase the national wealth and to increase the national security.

In the second place, unless our highways are made adequate the market for new automobiles will continue to shrink. More and more people will come to realize that it is folly to endanger an investment of two thousand dollars, or more, on narrow, winding, rough highways. When fewer cars and trucks are built, less steel is consumed. When less steel is consumed, less coal is burned. That is something very close to me and the people living in the district I have the honor to represent.

Finally, I cannot stress too much the importance of adequate highways to our national defense. The Eisenhower administration is wedded to the military strategy of fast and massive retaliation. The effectiveness of such a strategy depends upon speed all along the line, not just in a fast carrier or a jet bomber. In a time of mobilization, every truck on our highways will be making a contribution to power we exert on the enemy. All the money we appropriate for jet aircraft, fast ships, and speedy tanks will be of no avail if these weapons are shackled by a horse and buggy highway system.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, service on a committee of this House is more like service on a jury than anything I know. Those of you who have served on juries know that you will sit day after day and hear testimony and then hear the court give the instructions on the law, and then you will go out and all 12 of you will have a different idea as to what the verdict ought to be. Then you have to give and take. You do not surrender your convictions if it comes to that. You hang the jury.

There are 29 of us on this Committee on Public Works, and I presume that if we had had our way there would have been 29 different bills. I happen to represent a State that is rather thinly populated, and we are not entirely satisfied with the provisions of this bill. I think the division of the fund on the interstate highway system under this bill would get more votes and would be more equitable to the thinly populated and poorer States if the formula was 75/25. There are other features of the bill which I would change. I am not particularly strong for the idea of linkage because if we have the highway system, say, linked to the gasoline tax, and then a future Congress does away with the gasoline tax, we would be thrown into utter confusion with reference to our program. The interstate system is set

up on a formula different from the general road funds which obtained through the years since I have been here and before. I have had quite a few phone calls, and some telegrams, and some letters expressing concern over the fact that this bill takes away or disturbs the old formula of the primary, secondary, and urban roads. I think that comes about by reason of the fact that here for the second time we have the interstate or so-called defense roads system mentioned. Indirectly, this defense roads system or the interstate system will help us because it will take from the primary system, for instance, in the State of Arkansas, although I do not remember the mileage, but Highway No. 70 goes through our State, and Highway No. 67 from Little Rock and northeast through our State—as I say, I do not recall the mileage but whatever the mileage is, it is subtracted from the primary system which has heretofore declared in our State, and we will have that much more to put on the primary, secondary system, and the urban system. Another thing that disturbs me too is the formula. That is not new in this bill. It has been in other bills. We are losing population in the State of Arkansas, and it is largely because our road systems, our secondary or farm-to-market or rural routes and postal route roads are poor and people are just not going to live on those gravel roads when they can move to better roads. Then there is the so-called transfer in this bill as in the previous bill. We have a switch of 25 percent allowed. The highway department of the State of Arkansas, for instance, can take 25 percent of the funds allocated for secondary roads and use it on primary roads. But, by the same token, it can take 25 percent from the primary roads and use it on the secondary roads. The pressure gets pretty heavy on the highway department of the State. Personally, I would like to have that nailed down especially with reference to the secondary road system. Because if we can get those roads, and if they can be traveled over and get these people out of the mud, then our gas tax receipts will increase because the people will travel more. I can cite one instance in the district that I represent where the average travel on the highway was 75 vehicles per day, but it was paved and then the travel on that highway increased to about 300 vehicles per day. Of course, with the incidental increase in the gasoline tax money that was used.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman explain just how the State road department in my State or your State would take those funds that we are allocating for primary roads and use them on urban roads? Would the gentleman be a little more definite as to just how that could happen?

Mr. TRIMBLE. The highway department of the State, as I understand this legislation—and this was in legislation prior to this, and is not new in this particular bill—could, let us say, in the State of West Virginia have \$3 million for a

primary system, and then, if the highway department decides they need more funds on the secondary system, they could take 25 percent, or \$750,000, and set it over on the secondary system, or vice versa.

Mr. BAILEY. They could also take funds for secondary roads and use them for access roads to municipalities in the urban centers?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I am not sure about that. I would not want to be bound by a statement to that effect. I think they can shift 25 percent of any of these funds to any other fund. That is my understanding of the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of this subcommittee that has been making a study of this road problem the past 2 years. I want to commend the membership of this committee. As you listened to the debate today, you noticed some difference of opinion. Different areas are affected in different ways by this bill. It is a compromise bill between the various groups from the different types of States that we have in the United States, with the overall idea in mind that we are trying to pass legislation here which will do the greatest good to the greatest number of people.

Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to support H. R. 8127, because in my judgment, it is the most realistic highway construction bill ever considered by Congress. This bill was prepared after exhaustive hearings held many days last year in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, in which witnesses from all segments of our economy were heard. In addition, extensive hearings have been held this year before our Subcommittee on Roads, and the House Public Works Committee took final action on this bill after complete discussion.

There are many things in this bill that can be considered of a controversial nature. Each segment, however, of our people who are interested in highway construction, have something in this bill that commends itself to them. This bill raises the regular funds for highway construction \$100 million. In addition to that, \$200 million was established in comparatively new funds to be used on our strategic military network.

Altogether, this bill provides for additional construction of highways in our country amounting to over \$1 billion for the 2-year period fiscal 1956 and 1957. This is only a step in the right direction. It will not nearly meet the Nation's highway needs. I hope this expanded program will meet with such success that the people of the various States will ask Congress to increase the amount to be used on highway construction many millions of dollars per year in the near future.

We have been spending billions of dollars for foreign aid, and other billions for our military strength. It seems to me it is time that we are starting to partly meet our highway construction problems in the United States. This bill is a forward step in that direction.

Federal apportionment of funds State of Kansas would receive under new national Federal-aid-to-highways bill:

Primary.....	\$6,552,000
Secondary.....	4,587,000
Urban.....	1,390,000

Subtotal.....	12,529,000
---------------	------------

Interstate population formula.....	1,168,000
Old formula under sec. 21.....	2,446,000

Subtotal.....	3,614,000
---------------	-----------

Overall approximate total.....	16,143,000
1955 total.....	12,035,698

Increase per year.....	4,107,302
------------------------	-----------

Federal apportionment which Kansas is receiving under the 1952 law for fiscal 1954 and fiscal 1955:

1954	
Primary.....	\$5,950,738
Secondary.....	4,165,742
Urban.....	1,261,297
Interstate.....	605,853

Total.....	11,983,630
------------	------------

1955	
Primary.....	\$5,975,744
Secondary.....	4,183,753
Urban.....	1,267,798
Interstate.....	608,403

Total.....	12,035,698
------------	------------

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I should like to ask the gentleman a question; I should like to say beforehand, parenthetically, that I would not be so emboldened as to put my own individual judgment up against the judgment of the committee which has given so much thought and attention to this problem; not only to this one bill but to this problem over a period of years.

I want also to say that I have been in touch with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], who has always been attentive and interested and thoughtful and very nice about listening to suggestions. My concern with these public-works road bills now is that we have a tendency, in my judgment, to lose sight of the primary need for defense highways; and I get that idea from traveling through the country.

If we were to have world war III now I tremble to think about how we would move the traffic engendered by such a war over our highways, because they go through these urban centers, which are the first ones which would be knocked out, and they go through every town and village, and make no appreciable effort to bypass them. How to get military traffic through at a high rate of speed is the great question, and that is the thing that I see in the tendency, not of the committee so much, but the tendency of the citizens, the people, to overlook the need for defense highways.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct my remarks to section 2

(a), on page 5, this controversial proviso beginning in line 10. Despite what the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] says of this bill and has to say about there being no connection or no linkage there, a lot of people back in my State seem to think that there is.

I have before me here—and I would like to include in the RECORD—a statement by the public-relations officer of the Standard Oil Co. located in my State protesting it.

I have another from one of the officers of the State Contractors' Association protesting it.

I am wondering if the gentleman will again explain to the members of the Committee why there is not a connection there. They seem to think so and my mind is not clear that there is not. So I ask the gentleman to explain it.

Mr. McGREGOR. We simply say to the people that we cannot give you additional miles of better roads unless we have the money with which to do it. Now if we are talking about continuing the half-cent gas tax, that bill will be in here on Wednesday and everyone will have an opportunity to vote "yes" or "no" on the continuation of the gas tax. This can be changed overnight; there is nothing permanent about this legislation whatsoever.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. J. M. Douds says:

We are definitely opposed to the provision linking the gasoline tax and the Federal-aid highway program because of the traditional responsibility of the Federal Government to construct and maintain interstate post and military roads.

It has been the tradition of the Government to do that. Why use the gasoline tax to do it? That is the question all will ask.

Mr. McGREGOR. If you ask the average man on the street what the gasoline tax was used for he would say it was used for highways.

Mr. BAILEY. Under the circumstances I shall support the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the pending measure to amend the Federal Aid Road Act and to authorize increased appropriations for the construction of highways is an important measure and certainly represents a forward-looking and progressive piece of legislation.

The building of better highways and improved secondary road systems for the Nation is a nonpartisan issue. We all are for, or should be for, better roads and improved highways. The new bill represents an extension of the Federal Aid Highways Act of years past and provides for carrying forward the basic highway pattern of Federal Government and State cooperation on a matching funds basis—a 50-50 basis with some exceptions.

The bill would authorize the appropriation of \$600 million for each of the fiscal years of 1956 and 1957 and to be

made available to the States and expended as follows:

Two hundred and seventy millions of dollars for projects on Federal aid primary highway systems.

One hundred and eighty millions of dollars for Federal-aid projects on secondary road systems.

One hundred and fifty millions of dollars for projects on Federal-aid highway systems in urban areas.

Under this authorization, the State of Tennessee will receive \$5,851,000 in Federal aid funds for primary road construction; \$4,560,000 for Federal aid for secondary road construction; and \$2,139,000 for Federal aid for urban road construction—a total of \$12,550,000 in Federal aid for highway and rural road construction and development in the State of Tennessee—and a total of \$16,756,000 with the additional population increase basis.

This represents a substantial increase over funds provided in recent years and marks a progressive step forward. It is an indication of the fact that an increased highway construction program is needed and should be stimulated inasmuch as there has been a period of some laxity in road construction during the war years and postwar years.

Mr. Chairman, I have been somewhat concerned about the provisions contained in the bill with respect to the transfer of funds from rural to urban road purposes and vice versa. The bill would permit not exceeding 25 percent of the amount authorized to be appropriated to the States, in any one year, to be transferred from the apportionment under one system to either of the others.

Many of us are greatly concerned about the construction of rural roads and it is to be hoped there will not be any substantial diversion or transfer of funds herein appropriated for rural road development to urban projects. It is noted that such transfer of funds can only be effected when requested and certified to by State highway departments of the various States and being in the public interest, and when approved by the Secretary of Commerce.

The apportionment is the same as before—on a 50-50 basis except in the case of the authorization of \$200 million for interstate highway construction in which case a new formula is adopted with the Federal Government making a contribution of 60 percent as compared with 40 percent from the States. This is to stimulate an increased interstate highway construction program.

This is a progressive measure, a constructive measure and represents an extension of progressive legislation which has been in effect for a number of years.

I wish to commend members of the committee for recommending this legislation and I urge its adoption.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL], a member of the committee.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, insofar as linkage is concerned, it does not seem to me it makes a great deal of difference how you look at this matter. In West Virginia we have a gasoline tax which goes entirely to the support and maintenance

of the highway system. We may be in this particular bill adopting the principle of linkage, yet it is temporary and it does not necessarily mean that it is a precedent.

I do not believe, after getting extensive information in the hearings extending over many weeks, that we could possibly present to you a bill that would satisfy everybody; however, there is something about this bill which I think needs to be commended and that is this: In all these years that we have been neglecting our highways, we have been building more and more automobiles and creating more and more traffic. We have diverted funds which we really should have used for highway purposes. We have diverted those funds to other purposes.

Regardless of the criticism you may have of this particular bill, it does one thing, it at least makes a start toward the Federal Government's assumption of its duty to improve the Federal highways. If the money comes from the gasoline tax, if it comes from the general fund or from whatever source, we must recognize it is a start in the right direction and certainly there is not anything in this country that needs the support of Federal funds as much as the highway system of the Nation. I think this is a good bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. As author of the pending bill, I want to pay my respects to the splendid work that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL] has done in behalf of good legislation. He has made many excellent contributions to problems studied by our committee.

Mr. NEAL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to point out that I believe this committee has taken the wrong approach when it attempts to change the formula whereby you take the money authorized in this legislation and change it to the formula as set forth on page 4 of this bill. I say that for the reason that all of us know that heretofore the formula used has been satisfactory and also, may I say, that this authorization where it changes that formula will be a disadvantage to the thing that you desire to accomplish. The thing that you desire to accomplish, as I understand it, is national defense highways.

In my State as an example, there has only been authorized 661 miles of roads for national defense highways, but under this apportionment we stand to lose over a million dollars. I know it has been said around here that if you would take a look at the figures compiled on page 20 of the report it will be found that the State of Colorado pursuant to old apportionment received \$8,484,000, and that on page 18 in pursuance to the appointment as set forth therein the State of Colorado would get \$11,958,000,

an increase of approximately \$4 million. The thing that they have overlooked is that as they compiled the figures set forth on page 20 of the report they only used \$575 million as the appropriation.

In this bill we have \$800 million, and as the result, if we had had the same proportion—and it will apply to 29 other States—then we would have received in excess of almost \$13 million. Now, I can readily understand how many members of the Highway Engineers, meeting in a convention, were told that if you would follow this formula, then you would get \$3 or \$4 million for your respective States, but the thing that they did not tell them was that of the increased amount, and if they had followed the old formula, they would have received all the way from \$1 million to \$2 to \$5 million more under the old formula.

Mr. Chairman, it is therefore going to be my privilege when this bill is presented under the 5-minute rule to offer an amendment to strike that portion of the bill which deals with population only. I want to point out that if you are going to have this for a national-defense highway system, it is as essential to have that defense highway through sparsely settled sections of the United States as it is to have it in the thickly populated sections of the United States.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Under the formula on the interstate system of 60-40, the State of Colorado will get 65.16 percent of the Federal appropriation; in other words, you are getting 5.16 percent more than the average State will receive.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes, that is correct. This increase to Colorado is due to the fact the public lands formula has been employed. I have always supported the public land in the Highway Act, which the gentleman from Alabama well knows.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee or the author of the bill a question in regard to this interstate highway fund. In California we have one road that has given us a great deal of grief. It is Highway U. S. 40 which runs from San Francisco through Sacramento, over the Sierra Nevada Mountains at the Donner Pass and into Reno. It is an interstate highway. During the wintertime it is plugged up with snow and a great deal of the time is impassable. In the last session of the legislature the State legislature voted \$20 million to improve that highway, provided that the Federal Government would put up an additional \$20 million as a matching fund. Five of us Members of the House have introduced bills to authorize that particular contribution by the Federal Government, which would be additional and extra to the annual Federal aid allotment. Those measures are pending before your committee at this time, and we are seeking the support of the De-

fense Department for those bills, because this is a defense highway which, when blocked, cuts off the defense establishments east of the Sierra Nevada Mountains.

The question I want to ask the gentleman is this: Since \$200 million has been put into this bill, would it be possible to take California's portion of that \$200 million and use it in connection with the \$20 million now set aside and earmarked by the State of California for the improvement of Highway 40?

Mr. MCGREGOR. It would be, if it were so recommended by the California State Highway Department and concurred in by the Bureau of Public Roads. They could probably take that amount before it is allocated anywhere else, because it would probably have preferential treatment because of its military value.

Mr. ENGLE. The State of California has already indicated the preferential treatment it wants to give this highway. As I understand, if the State of California, its road official, can convince the Bureau of Public Roads that this allocation which goes to California out of that \$200 million should be used on Highway 40, it can be used for that purpose.

Mr. MCGREGOR. If they can prove it to the Public Roads Administration, it can be taken as part of the California share under this new legislation; we are stressing the \$200 million interstate because of military value.

Mr. ENGLE. And because that is a primary defense highway?

Mr. MCGREGOR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank the gentleman, and I compliment the committee on the excellent work it has done on this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(a) \$270,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

(b) \$180,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

(c) \$150,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas, and for projects on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system within urban areas.

The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year, respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

Any sums apportioned to any State under the provision of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be*

deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this act: Provided further, That in the case of those sums apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary of Commerce may discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects upon his receipt and approval of a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of the respective States applicable to projects in this category approved by him: Provided further, That not more than 25 percent of the amount apportioned to each State under subparagraphs (a), (b), or (c) of this section may be transferred from the apportionment under one subparagraph to the apportionment under either of the other subparagraphs: Provided further, That such transfer is requested by the State highway department and is approved by the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest: Provided further, That the total of such transfers shall not increase the original apportionment under any subparagraph by more than 25 percent: Provided further, That the transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any prior or subsequent fiscal year: And provided further, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

Sec. 2. (a) For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$200 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the following manner: one-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the money so apportioned; and one-half in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system: Provided further, That the Federal share payable on account of any project on the national system of interstate highways provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased to 60 percent of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 40 percent of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area: Provided further, That the Secretary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, unless a Federal excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1954; and the Secretary of Commerce shall not apportion to the States the sum authorized by this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, unless a Fed-*

eral excise tax on gasoline in the amount of not less than 2 cents per gallon is in effect on September 30, 1955.

(b) Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of fiscal year for which such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to be expended upon execution of formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects under this section.

(c) Any amount apportioned to the States under the provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (b) of this section shall lapse.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That the authorization in section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 for forest highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is hereby canceled; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction: *Provided further*, That hereafter funds available for forest development roads and trails shall also be available for vehicular parking areas: *Provided further*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

(b) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of parkways, authorized by acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

SEC. 5. Any unappropriated balance of the sums heretofore authorized to be appropri-

ated by sections 5 and 6 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 158), for the Rama Road in Nicaragua and the Inter-American Highway, respectively, for the fiscal years 1953 and 1954, shall continue to be authorized to be appropriated for such purposes for the fiscal years 1955 and 1956.

SEC. 6. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952 (66 Stat. 158), not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 7. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 8. All acts or parts of acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and this act shall take effect on its passage.

SEC. 9. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby directed to make a study in cooperation with the State highway departments and other parties in interest relative to the problems posed by necessary relocation and reconstruction of public utilities services resulting from highway improvements authorized under this act. Among other things, such a study shall include a review and financial analysis of existing relationships between the State highway departments and affected utilities of all types, and a review of the various State statutes regulating existing relationships, to the end that a full and informative report may be made to the President for transmittal to the Congress of the United States not later than February 1, 1955.

SEC. 10. The term "highway," as defined in section 2 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212), as amended and supplemented, shall be deemed to include "tunnels."

SEC. 11. The Secretary of Commerce may approve as a part of the Federal-aid secondary system, extensions through urban areas, connecting points on that system, provided that Federal participation in projects on such extensions shall be limited to urban funds.

SEC. 12. For the purpose of expediting the interstate planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road and appurtenances thereto traversing the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico in general conformity with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and with the recommended plan set forth in the joint report submitted to the Congress November 28, 1951, by the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior pursuant to the act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 262, 81st Cong.), there is hereby authorized to be expended by the Secretary of Commerce from general administrative funds not to exceed \$250,000; the amount expended under this section shall be apportioned among the 10 States bordering the Mississippi River in proportion to the amount allocated by these respective States for the improvement and extension of existing sections of this highway project as approved by the Secretary of Commerce in cooperation with other public agencies concerned therewith.

SEC. 13. This act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954."

Mr. DONDERO (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman have any idea how much time we will have for debate before we are shut off?

Mr. DONDERO. There is no disposition on the part of the chairman to shut off debate.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I know there is no such disposition on the part of the gentleman, but I want to know if we can have some time, because there are some things that should be discussed on this bill.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I certainly will not object, I wonder if in the opinion of the members of the committee on that side we might finish the legislation tonight, and set a time of not later than 6 o'clock, we will say, for closing debate.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Of course, there is no disposition on this side of the aisle that I know of to extend debate on the bill. I see no reason why we cannot conclude it tonight. I suggest that we proceed and see how we come out, and then consider closing debate.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, the immediate request will of course be granted, and certainly, as the chairman has pointed out, there is no disposition to shut off debate. However, in scheduling the program for the week, it was my understanding after consultation generally that we could conclude the matter today. I am very sure that we can. I have checked at the desk and there are three amendments there. That does not necessarily mean that there are not other amendments that will be offered, because Members may have amendments that are not at the desk. If Members do have amendments, if they would send them to the desk we could tell better how we could proceed in order to grant plenty of time for the discussion of the amendments that may be offered.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEMPSEY:
Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$700,000,000."
Page 2, line 3, strike out "\$270,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$315,000,000."
Page 2, line 5, strike out "\$180,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$210,000,000."
Page 2, line 7, strike out "\$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$175,000,000."

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. In view of the fact that it is proposed to continue the gasoline tax at 2 cents, we will build up an additional fund of about \$500 million from the 1st of February of this year until the 1st of July of next year.

There is nothing in this bill we have before us which provides for spending any money before the fiscal years 1956 and 1957. The amount of money in addition that I am asking is \$100 million to be given to these categories that have not been treated very generously in this bill. They are the primary system, the secondary system, and the urban system. The primary system would get an additional \$45 million, on the same ratio as they would under the formula now. The secondary system would get \$30 million and the urban system would get \$25 million. That is the formula that has been in effect for a great many years. Everybody who speaks about highways is concerned about the accidents we have been having and the lack of funds we need to do the job that has to be done. If we want to be sincere about this thing, I do not believe we should continue for another year and 3 months with not one additional dime for highways in view of the increase in accidents. We should provide something additional for 1956-57. That is all there is to this amendment. It affects every segment of this Nation. It affects all people. It provides the same formula that we have been working on for a great many years. I think the money is available and I do not see any excuse not to adopt this amendment.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, is it the purpose of the gentleman to take that \$100 million from the \$200 million provided in section 2?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It has nothing to do with that at all. This is just an additional \$100 million. This amendment has nothing to do with that.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, you are seeking to set this up one year?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No, I am asking to set up an additional \$100 million for each of the fiscal years 1956-57. And I hope we may get some of that back before that time.

Mr. DONDERO. That means that you want to increase the bill by \$100 million.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is right. It may be that we will get the authority to use some of it earlier, but the bill we are considering now, notwithstanding what the President said about the highway accidents, what he said about these killings on the highways, and what he said about using this gasoline tax for construction, does not provide sufficient money to do the job, in my opinion. The funds authorized by this amendment will at least help out and help in the categories that have not been given anything in a great many years. You set up \$50 million for many, many years for that category.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. STEED. Do I understand the main purpose you have here in asking for this \$100 million increase is due to the fact that for the next year or slightly

more than 1 year you are going to continue to collect the 2-cent gasoline tax?

Mr. DEMPSEY. For 1 year and 3 months.

Mr. STEED. And that money will be spent on building roads?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is right. I am asking for \$100 million additional for 15 months, and I think we should use some of it.

Mr. STEED. If your amendment is adopted, then in these 2 following years you are going to have a total of \$200 million additional?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is right.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It is my understanding the gentleman is talking about the 3 categories where the States match funds on a 50-50 basis?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes, that is right.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am certain the gentleman has listened to the testimony. There were a number of States wondering whether they would be able to match the funds that we have established here in this bill to say nothing of matching any additional funds.

Mr. DEMPSEY. May I point out to the chairman that if there are any States that cannot match it, they are not required to match the funds. But, if they can match the funds—and I am sure they would if they were given the opportunity—we are giving them another year to do so. Certainly, they will be able to match the funds. The gentleman is trying to predict what the States will do. The Bureau of Public Roads told you that they have not failed yet.

Mr. MCGREGOR. But you do have on record the fact that there are other States that cannot match the amount that we have in the bill now before us. The gentleman knows, if he is making assurances, as he suggested, that we have no assurance as to what the gasoline-tax income for the coming year is going to be. As of now, it is \$906 million without any increase. I would ask the gentleman in all sincerity, because I know he believes in a balanced budget, where are we going to get this extra \$100 million?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will tell the gentleman where we can get this extra \$100 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DEMPSEY was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DEMPSEY. I got my figures primarily from the chairman, who stated to the Rules Committee that we had \$100 million or more last year. He also stated that it was increasing at the rate of about 5 percent per year. So there would be \$45 million more in 1 year, or \$56 million in 15 months.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will yield to my chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman understands that we are stepping up this bill now over \$225 million above what it was at any previous time. We did that for the purpose of practically absorbing all of the gasoline tax. We are

within \$31 million of it now. If the gentleman's amendment prevails, we would go a way beyond that.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman has put in \$70 million that he knows is not going to be appropriated. They are not matching funds with the Federal Government. They have to do with Indian roads, and with parks, and such things as that, which really do not come before the committee. They do not represent a matching proposition. They are in the same category as in 1952.

Mr. DONDERO. But the money comes out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The money comes out of the Federal Treasury, certainly. But you are delaying this action for a year or 15 months. That is what you are doing, if you do not appropriate this money until 1956 or 1957. With all of this gasoline tax money coming in, under your own figures it will be close to \$500 million and we will not be doing anything about building roads.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The question of the amount of money provided for roads in this bill has been considered thoroughly by the members of the committee. That was done before we reported it to the House. No one suggested that we should increase the amount of the bill. If the gentleman's amendment were adopted, we would be authorizing more money than is coming into the Federal Treasury from the gasoline tax, if you want to link the question of the gasoline tax with the question of road funds.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. At no time did my distinguished friend from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] bring this amendment before the committee. This bill came out of the committee by a unanimous vote. We all recognize that it is not as much as we want, but it is a compromise and my good friend voted for it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for just a word?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I did everything in my power to get the chairman of the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee to approve more money for urban roads, did I not? The gentleman said that there was no way to do it except by changing the formula. I tried to prevail upon the gentleman to change the formula for the interstate roads, but in what the gentleman has done he has hurt the other category, the primary system of highways. I did every thing in my power to get additional money for these roads, because the amount of money was inadequate. I asked the chairman of the committee if we would have a chance to get some additional money for 1955 and he said, "No." If we can for 1955, we should; if not, for 1956 or 1957; just so the money is available.

Mr. DONDERO. Money is provided in this bill for 1956 and 1957. The question of money for 1954 and 1955 has already been disposed of and the money allocated to the States. The amendment would increase the total another \$100 million.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In January 1953, when we convened I introduced a bill providing for \$200 million for interstate roads. The gentleman put in a bill for \$250 million. I went along with him. I did not want my bill, I wanted his. But he did not do anything about it, and he is not doing anything about it now, except what is in this bill.

Mr. DONDERO. That may be true, but we have done this, we have added to the bill before the House now \$225 million more than any previous bill.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Certainly.

Mr. DONDERO. I think we have gone a long way in increasing the amount of the authorization.

Mr. DEMPSEY. We have done that because of the terrific increase in the gasoline tax we are collecting.

Mr. DONDERO. But this bill takes nearly all the gasoline tax; we are within \$31 million of it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman's figures are in error.

Mr. DONDERO. I doubt it very much.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Those are not the figures the gentleman has been using.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the House vote down this amendment, because if it is approved we would be providing far in excess of what the present program for roads contains.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. SCUDDER. I just want to make an observation: There is about \$100 million involved in the difference between the highway users' gasoline tax and other forms of tax paid in under this legislation. Now if we do get to a point where they are charging us with linkage, then I think that we would have plenty of opportunity for our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol to bring in an amendment to strike that part out. I think we are on dangerous ground in endeavoring to absorb all this money that comes in from both the users' tax and nonusers' tax.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. We are appropriating money for the years 1956 and 1957. Is it not true that by that time we will have about \$1,200,000,000 in the tax?

Mr. DONDERO. At the rate of increase of 5 percent a year.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Then the fact of the matter is that we would be using up only about \$900 million out of \$1,200,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. That may be true.

I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DEMPSEY) there were—ayes 17, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: Page 9, line 15, strike out all of section 9 on pages 9 and 10 and insert a new section to be known as section 9 and to read as follows:

"Sec. 9. No part of any appropriation authorized by this act shall be used to defray any part of the cost of relocating, reconstructing, or improving any public utility service."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment not because I have any desire to change anything that is being done under the present law, but I am fearful of the effect of section 9.

I was rather amazed when the author of this bill told me upon interrogation that there was support in that committee advocating a policy of using a part of the tax money to reimburse or to help pay a part of the cost of construction or relocation or reconstruction or improvement of public utilities. I think that in this bill unless we take out section 9, you are beginning to establish a policy of paying a part of the expenses which should be borne by the public utilities and which no one ever dreamed would come out of the pockets of the payers of gasoline taxes to help relocate gas lines, electric lines, telephone lines, and what have you. Already the various States are giving free rights-of-way to these utilities, permitting them to tear up along the sides of the highways, the shoulders, if you please, interrupting traffic and causing great inconvenience to the traveling public. We are already doing that.

Here someone is proposing through this study to do something else, and I think we might as well face the situation. We all realize that under this administration no one will deny it is anything but favorable to the public utilities. The Secretary of Commerce could very well next time bring in a report and a recommendation that we allocate a certain percentage of these funds to pay the public utilities for a part of the work which they should do themselves. I say that already we are giving the utilities enough when we grant them the privilege of using the right-of-way and when we subject ourselves to the inconvenience caused thereby.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I think my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GEORGE. Under existing law the utilities that are occupying their own rights-of-way can be reimbursed 50 percent under Federal aid. The gentleman's amendment will fix it so that no money whatever can be paid to the utilities.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No. If they are occupying their own rights-of-way, yes, but practically all of this right-of-way is along State highways. It is not

owned by the utility. They pay nothing for the use of it, they pay no rental or lease, they get it absolutely free, and I am not in favor of taking gasoline tax money to reimburse utilities for doing something they should be doing themselves.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the view of the majority of this committee, but the gentleman's amendment would change existing law.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No. Under the present law they cannot use these funds for that because the State Highway Department does not include it as a part of the cost of construction. They make no application for Federal funds for that purpose. They are not paying it now and I do not want them to pay it in the future.

Mr. GEORGE. It is considered part of the highway in our State if they are occupying their own right-of-way and is to be charged against construction. If they are on a public right-of-way or on a highway that is an entirely different matter.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman does not want to use part of this money to pay a public utility for moving a gas line or a cable line or anything like that, does he?

Mr. GEORGE. Not according to the telegrams I have been getting and according to the hearings. I conducted the hearings on this problem and they did not think I was on that side.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am glad the gentleman is on my side and if that is the case I know he will support my amendment.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. Chairman, we want to be fair with all segments of our economy, whether it is the labor group, the farm group, the utility group or whoever it might be. The committee had under discussion for many days, a proposal that 5 percent of the money authorized under this legislation be used for the relocation of utilities, both private and public. We did have a lot of evidence that there was a possible problem relative to utility relocations. Even those who do not believe in the utility program recognized that. We were informed that some of the small utility groups were made completely bankrupt by the relocation of highway systems. We decided that rather than make it a mandatory provision of 5 percent we would authorize a study in conjunction with the State highway departments and the Secretary of Commerce and other parties in interest. To me this is nothing more than fair.

Next year you can vote on it, whether you think it is right or whether you think it is wrong, but certainly these people are entitled to their term in court. May I say to my distinguished friend that many of the States are using State moneys for doing this very thing? I concur in the statement of my colleague from Kansas, that should this amendment prevail we would have to have some corrective amendments relative to State laws.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee who wrote the bill whether this provision would cover the case of an interstate pipeline company, for instance, transporting petroleum up here to Washington, or natural gas.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think it would, sir. They would come under the study, because we endeavored to make it broad. You will note "State highway departments and other parties in interest," so that they can report back to the Congress, I think it is, in February 1955.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman will admit, though, that the Secretary of Commerce already has the authority to make this study, without directing it, and without providing an opening wedge for coming in for this percentage that you say a member of the committee already endorses.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It is very much in question whether the Secretary of Commerce has authority. He might be going beyond his line of authority to make that investigation and have the right and privilege of calling in other interested parties. I am taking the position that I think they are entitled to a study being made.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. This study would include, would it not, also the small utility districts that are entirely membership propositions; non-profit? For example, a small water district organization may be adjacent to a large city but not a part of the city water system.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I want to say to my distinguished colleague, and I do appreciate his interest, those are the very ones that caused some of the members of our committee to agree even to a study.

Mr. PRIEST. I fully agree with the gentleman, and I hope that the amendment will be rejected and the study be made, because I feel in that particular field there is certainly a case for a very real study to be made as it might affect the small utility districts.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, after some real authorities have spoken on this subject, like the chairman of the subcommittee, I hate to add any remarks here, but I rise in opposition to the amendment and would like to explain the situation with which my home town community is faced. My home town, the growing city of Jacksonville, Fla., owns many of the things which ordinarily are owned by private industry. Jacksonville owns its own public utilities and was faced very

recently with a situation which shows up the inequity of the present legislation, because when a Federal highway was built through the center of the city of Jacksonville they paid the railroads for the small disturbance they made for them, but they entirely overlooked the municipal public utilities whose damages ran into millions of dollars. Now, so I am advised, the city of Jacksonville, if they had been placing this Federal highway, would not have placed it where it was placed. As a matter of fact, the State authority and the Federal authorities got together on a location which suited them just fine but it did not suit the city of Jacksonville at all, because this particular location cost the city a great deal of money in requiring the relocation of its utilities. If this location had been moved just a block to the right or to the left, it would not have cost nearly that much money. Should the Federal and the State governments be allowed to come into a city like Jacksonville and tell its public utility that it has to pay out \$2 million for improving this road which this city would have preferred to be located elsewhere? That does not seem to me to be a proper and just procedure.

The approach to this problem which we of the Jacksonville area are advocating is embodied in H. R. 7897 which I introduced recently in the House. The first section of H. R. 7897 redefines "construction" as used in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 to include "relocation and readjustment of utility facilities necessitated by the construction or reconstruction of the highway." Section 2 of my bill would put nonrailway utilities on an equal basis with railroad facilities, with the same limitation as to Federal funds which may be used for readjusting and relocating nonrailway utility facilities. Section 5 (b) of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 provides a formula where railroads reimburse the United States for a small amount when it has been established that the railroad has received a net benefit from the project. However, there can be no net benefit to nonrailway utility facilities, so this proposed draft leaves the present provisions of law applicable to railway facilities exactly as they are, and adds the new provisos applicable alone to nonrailway utility facilities.

Section 2 of my bill makes the bill applicable only to Federal funds heretofore or hereafter apportioned to the States. This excludes any application of the proposed statute to Federal funds already expended.

Interest in this problem is shown by this committee including section 9 of the bill now before the House.

I believe the committee's study of this problem over the last 3 years and the study now underway by the committee give sufficient foundation for concrete action along the lines of H. R. 7897.

The problem in Jacksonville arising out of the construction of the Jacksonville Expressway is an illustration of the need for this legislation. The expressway is part of the Federal-aid system and as such has been recognized as a project built to defend our country and to facilitate interstate commerce. City

officials tell me that the project was well underway before they were advised that these facilities would have to be moved, and that the city would have to bear the expense of relocation. This is an expense of one and a half to two million dollars. This thrusts upon the city the necessity of raising this money either by taxes or by increased utility rates. Both alternatives present complicated and difficult problems.

Briefly, there are several reasons why these expenses should be considered a part of the construction. First, the cost of alterations to railroads is already recognized as a legitimate part of the highway construction costs. There is no logical or ethical reason why such discrimination between railroad and non-railroad utilities should be allowed to continue.

Second, the law as it now stands creates an inequity because in some States this Federal benefit is available and in others it is not. Whatever a State wants to do with its own highway system should be left up to the State involved, but a Federal benefit should not be withheld from a local utility on the basis of a State's highway policies.

Third, to allow the present condition to continue places a double burden on residents of the localities involved by requiring Federal taxation for support of the Federal highway system and also requiring increased local taxes or utility rates to pay for the Federal function of moving the utilities for the Federal highway.

At this point I include the provisions of H. R. 7897:

H. R. 7897

A bill to amend the laws relating to the construction of Federal-aid highways to provide for equality of treatment of railroads and other public utilities with respect to the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of such highways by defining the term "construction" to include relocation and readjustment of utility facilities necessitated by the construction or reconstruction of such highways and by prescribing the extent to which Federal funds may be used for the relocation and readjustment of such utility facilities

Be it enacted, etc., That the definition of the term "construction" contained in the first section of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"The term 'construction' means the supervising, inspecting, actual building, and all expenses incidental to the construction or reconstruction of a highway, including locating, surveying, and mapping, costs of rights-of-way, relocation and readjustment of utility facilities necessitated by the construction or reconstruction of the highway, and elimination of hazards of railway-grade crossings."

SEC. 2. Section 5 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *Provided further*, That the entire cost of relocation and readjustment of nonrailway utility facilities necessitated by the construction or reconstruction of any highway with funds made available under the foregoing provisions of this act also may be paid from Federal funds, except that not more than 50 percent of the right-of-way and property damage costs, paid from public funds, on any such project, may be paid from Federal funds: *Provided further*, That not more than

10 percent of the sums apportioned to any State under the terms of this act for each fiscal year shall be used for the relocation and readjustment of such nonrailroad utility facilities, to be expended in accordance with the Federal-Aid Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, and the provisions of this section."

Sec. 3. The foregoing provisions of this act shall be applicable with respect to all Federal funds heretofore or hereafter apportioned to each State for Federal-aid highway projects.

At this point I include a statement by Mayor Haydon Burns, of Jacksonville, in which he was joined by William Madison, city attorney for Jacksonville, both very able city officials:

THE EVER-EXPANDING PROGRAM OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION MAKES REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS OF READJUSTING UTILITY FACILITIES IMPERATIVE

A serious problem confronts utilities, with the exception of the railroads, whether they be public or private, in connection with the readjustment of their facilities attendant upon the construction and improvement of highways and railroad grade crossings where related to the improvement of the system of Federal-aid roads. The acceleration of public road construction under the Federal-aid highway program to meet the needs of interstate commerce and the national defense has made the problem one of urgent moment. These roads, containing double lanes, overpasses, underpasses, and cloverleafs require greater widths for rights-of-way and the extensive readjustment of utility facilities to accommodate them has imposed a cost burden that greatly overshadows that necessary to meet local road requirements. Such an imposition on nonrailroad utilities of relocation costs necessarily incurred under the Federal-aid program is unfair, burdensome, and inequitable to the users of utility services who, in the long run, will be forced to bear these costs.

FEDERAL FUNDS ARE AUTHORIZED FOR PAYMENT TO THE RAILROADS OF READJUSTMENT COSTS BUT ARE DENIED, UNDER THE GENERAL PRACTICE, TO ALL OTHER UTILITIES

The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838; U. S. Code Cong. Service, 1944, p. 840) makes no specific provision for payment from Federal funds of any portion of the expense of relocating or readjusting the facilities of utilities which are located within highway rights-of-way and which must necessarily move to accommodate Federal-aid highway projects.

On the other hand, the Federal Aid Highway Act authorizes payment from Federal funds of costs in relocating facilities of railroads which are located within the highway right-of-way and which are included in Federal-aid grade crossing projects. The regulations of the Bureau of Roads relieve the railroads of making any contribution toward the elimination of railway-highway grade crossings in connection with Federal-aid projects, even where applicable State laws impose a duty on the railroads to bear a substantial part of the cost of eliminating such hazards at grade crossings.

Furthermore, the Bureau of Public Roads has consistently refused reimbursement to nonrailroad utilities except where State authorities determine that nonrailroad utilities are relieved of this obligation under State laws.

This ruling of the Bureau of Public Roads has prevailed even where the relocation of non-railroad-utility facilities was necessitated because of railway grade crossing elimination projects.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE THROUGH CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITY TO RELIEVE THE INEQUITABLE BURDEN PRESENTLY IMPOSED ON NONRAILROAD UTILITIES?

At the first session of the present Congress, the Subcommittee on Roads of the House Public Works Committee held extensive hearings under the authority of a resolution authorizing it to make a comprehensive study and review of the highway problem. On July 8, 1953, upon invitation of this subcommittee numerous representatives and spokesmen for public and privately owned utilities and cooperatives appeared before the subcommittee urging the enactment of legislation which would relieve utility users of the inequitable burden attendant upon relocation costs. Heading the list of those who appeared before the subcommittee was the representative of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners which is an organization composed of Federal and State bodies which regulate utility activities and operations.

Among those appearing before the Subcommittee on Roads on this occasion were the representatives of the following organizations:

National Association of Railroad & Utilities Commissioners.

Bell System Telephone Companies.

National Institute of Municipal Law Officers.

American Transit Association.

United States Independent Telephone Association.

American Water Works Association.

Western Union Telegraph Co.

Tennessee Valley Public Power Association.

American Public Power Association.

Kansas City Power & Electric Co.

City of Nashville Public Works Department.

Michigan Consolidated Gas Co.

American Gas Association (Syracuse Suburban Gas Co., Inc.).

Consolidated Gas, Electric Light & Power Co. of Baltimore.

National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.

Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co.

Dayton Power & Light Co.

Marietta Electric Co.

Ohio Edison Co.

Toledo Edison Co.

Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co.

There is now pending before the Public Works Committee of the Senate a bill introduced by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado (S. 1108), the purpose of which is to authorize reimbursement to nonrailroad utilities, of relocation costs incurred in connection with Federal-aid highway projects. This measure is similar to bills introduced in the 82d Congress by Senator McKellar and Representative DAVIS, both of Tennessee. No action was taken on S. 1108 by the committee during the 1st session of the 83d Congress.

ARGUMENTS ADVANCED BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS BY REPRESENTATIVES OF AFFECTED UTILITY GROUPS

I

The added costs and expenses made necessary by the relocation of utility facilities to accommodate Federal-aid highway projects constitutes a burden which must, in the final analysis, be borne by the subscriber, since the expense of furnishing utility services can only be realized through rates charged to and collected from subscribers of utility services.

The former Commissioner of Public Roads, Hon. Thomas H. MacDonald, in supporting the law authorizing reimbursement from Federal funds to railroads, stated, in testimony before the House Public Works Committee in 1944: "If funds were contributed by the railroads they would have to come

from their earnings; that is, they would have to be gathered from the public." (Hearings before Committee on Roads, House of Representatives, 78th Cong., 2d sess., on H. R. 2426, vol. 2, p. 968.)

It is strongly urged that the same reasoning applies with equal force to users of non-railroad utility services.

II

Utilities use the highway rights-of-way through grants of franchise rights by State and local governments. These grants were not made just to favor the utilities but that the public welfare might be enhanced through the development and extension of utility services throughout the several States. The use of the highways for utility purposes is a proper public purpose and function and is in the public interest.

Utility development would be retarded greatly and rates would be prohibitive for many citizens if utilities were forced to acquire private rights-of-way for a function essentially public in nature.

III

The use of Federal funds for Federal-aid highway purposes is primarily justified on the theory that these highways are constructed in the interest of national defense and interstate commerce for the general welfare. Taxes levied on the general public provide the funds thus expended. The non-railroad utility subscriber, as a member of the general public pays his fair share of all Federal taxes, but must also pay, through rates charged for services, all costs and expenses incurred for the relocation of the utilities facilities. Thus the nonrailroad utility user makes a double contribution to the cost of Federal-aid highway construction—once in taxes and again in rates. He is thereby doubly taxed. Such a discrimination between classes of taxpayers is completely unjustified and discriminatory.

IV

The relocation of nonrailroad utility facilities is necessitated only because of the construction or reconstruction of a Federal-aid highway or railroad grade crossing in order to meet needs of the general traveling public. Utility subscribers receive no greater benefits from Federal-aid highway construction than any other user of the highway; no improvement in service results. Hence, relocation costs should be treated as a part of construction costs of the highway just as any other cost. For many years Congress has given recognition to this principle in connection with the relocating of railroad facilities. A different treatment for nonrailroad utilities is wholly unjustified.

V

There can be no argument against reimbursement of railroads for relocation costs in connection with Federal-aid highway projects. But thus relieving one utility, the railroads, of a burden left to be borne by other utilities is beyond defense on any sound basis. This unfair and inequitable discrimination is compounded when we consider that the railroad facilities create a hazard to the traveling public, but the facilities of other utilities are quite harmless from the standpoint of public safety.

It has been said that railroads should be reimbursed because their facilities are situated within private rights-of-way. If this were uniformly true the railroads would not need the benefit of Federal legislation since their rights would be protected under the eminent domain laws. Actually, whether the railroad facilities are on public or private right-of-way at the site of the highway-railway grade crossing is immaterial. The point is that virtually all States impose on railroads an obligation to bear all or a substantial part of the cost of relocating their facilities at railroad-grade crossings irrespective of whether the railroad is

on public or private right-of-way. The theory of these statutes is that the railroad creates the hazard to the public required to be eliminated, which justifies the imposition of these special burdens on them. Yet, the Federal-Aid Highway Act expressly relieves the railroads of that liability and provides reimbursement to the railroads for any relocation costs incurred by them in connection with Federal-aid projects. These circumstances further illustrate the justification for authorizing reimbursement to nonrailroad utilities of the relocation costs incurred by them in connection with Federal-aid projects.

VI

As a result of the expansion of the Federal-aid highway system, the problem of relocation cost is becoming serious to nonrailroad utilities. Roads geared to the needs of the national defense and interstate commerce replace local and State roads. The new and elaborate highways require greatly widened rights-of-way. The extensive relocation of utility lines, required by these superhighways, imposes on subscribers to utility services a substantial cost far in excess of that required to accommodate roads of a character suitable for local needs only.

VII

In recent years many States have passed statutes providing for the construction of freeways or turnpikes. These freeways or turnpikes are similar in size and character to Federal-aid highways. The State legislatures which have enacted such legislation have recognized that public utilities should be fully reimbursed for relocation costs made necessary by the construction of such freeways or turnpikes. The following States have acted in such a manner: Florida (1953), Georgia (1952), Kansas (1950), Kentucky (1953), Michigan (1953), New Jersey (1948), New York (1946), North Carolina (1951), Ohio (1949), Oklahoma (1953), Texas (1953), and Virginia (1952).

Hence, it may be observed that recognition is being accorded to the changing character of modern roadways as they affect the use and placement of utility facilities.

So many inquiries have been made by members of congressional committees, and properly so, regarding the costs involved in relocating nonrailroad utility facilities that for the purpose of developing information on the subject the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners suggested that a study be made to determine such costs. Twelve representative States were selected and certain information was obtained by committees composed of representatives from the various utilities both publicly and privately owned.

The study encompassed all Federal-aid highway projects completed in a recent 12-month period as well as the cost borne by each utility as a result of relocating facilities to accommodate each Federal-aid project excluding any cost resulting from improvement or betterment of the particular facilities.

This study reveals that the cost to all nonrailroad utilities of relocating facilities to accommodate Federal-aid highway projects was 2.34 percent of the total cost of such projects. While these costs pose serious problems for individual utilities, and their subscribers, they constitute a very small part, indeed, of the total cost of constructing Federal-aid highways.

Some suggestion was made during the course of the hearings in July before the Subcommittee on Roads that the exercise of greater care by highway authorities in the selection of routes would reduce the expense of relocation of nonrailway utility facilities below the figure mentioned in the preceding paragraph. Nothing could encourage such a result to a greater extent than the enactment

of legislation authorizing reimbursement to the nonrailroad utilities of their relocation costs.

It has been contended that this cost added to the annual cost of the Federal-aid program would reduce the miles of roads which could be constructed. This argument overlooks every equitable principle involved in the matter. With equal force and justification it could be argued that private property owners should not be compensated from Federal funds because this likewise would reduce the funds which would otherwise be available for highway construction purposes. It is difficult to comprehend how such an argument could justify the unfair burden presently imposed on the subscribers of nonrailroad utility services who are forced to make a double contribution toward the cost of construction of Federal-aid highways, whereas they receive no benefits in excess of those received by the members of the public who only contributed once.

I would like to conclude by saying I certainly hope that the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] will be defeated, because this study is very greatly needed. I personally feel that much more than this should be done. I think the testimony before the committee shows that public utilities certainly need assistance at this time.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SCUDDER. Complaint was made before the committee that the engineers had put in a subterranean bypass where they might have relocated it somewhere else and put in an overpass. The plan of putting in the subterranean bypass disturbed all the utilities and caused a great amount of expense to the utility owners. If such a bill were passed it might result in the engineers being a little more careful how many utility lines they disturbed.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 4, line 18, after "following manner", strike out the remainder of line 18 and all down to and including the word "system" in line 24 and insert the following: "In the manner now provided by law for apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the money so apportioned."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is merely to reinstate what I consider a successful operation under the apportionment of money under the present law. It is conceded that this change in apportionment is based one-half upon the population of the State and the other half upon the amount of roads in the respective States. My amendment, instead of taking one-half on the population and one-half on roads, would make it conform to the present law, where you take into consideration the three separate factors, the area, the roads, and the population.

I believe the Committee should consider that, this being a national defense highway, and that is what I understand the object and purpose of it is, a road in a sparsely settled part of the country is as essential as in other sections of the country. The best way I can illustrate it is that when the attack on Pearl Harbor occurred in 1941, when the roads were not able to carry much of the military equipment, the railroads out my way were loaded day after day and day after day with a full right-of-way of military equipment going to the west coast.

If the object and purpose of this legislation, and that is what they told me in the Committee here a moment ago, is to provide national defense highways, then why cannot we make it on a formula that will assure us that we will have an adequate highway defense system?

May I point out to this Committee that in my State of Colorado, where you have the Continental Divide from Wyoming down to New Mexico, you have a large range of mountains. We have 661 miles in the State of Colorado. If you are going to have a national defense highway, you are going to have to have some money to take care of those mountains and those problems.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The purpose of the gentleman's amendment would be to take the \$200 million interstate which we provide additionally in this bill and have it come under the existing formula as it stands now under the old law?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is right.

Mr. DONDERO. One-third, one-third, and one-third?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is right, because I think that the experience of this legislation since it was first enacted has proven that to be equitable and fair.

Mr. DONDERO. That would in no way recognize the populated sections of the country like the large cities where 40 percent of the traffic originates.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Except that you have changed the formula here where the Federal Government contributes 60 percent of the funds without the 50-50 basis, as I understand it, and now it is a 60-40 proposition. You have made available, as I believe you pointed out a moment ago in this bill, approximately \$250 million more than at any other particular time to help take care of that situation. Now if you found the necessity of getting additional funds, as we are in this legislation, why do you want to change the formula which everybody has felt is satisfactory? That is the purpose of my amendment, and I feel it would supply a sufficient sum to the populated areas.

Mr. DONDERO. Of course, this matter was discussed at great length in committee, and I admit it comes to the floor as a matter of compromise. We divided the money—\$100 million for the interstate system and \$100 million to the urban centers.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I compliment the gentleman. I know he has made a tremendous study of this problem and has come up with the formula that we have in this bill. I merely want to point out that with the wide spaces and with the tremendous amount of work you have to go through in building these roads through the mountains, if you are going to have any particular east-west national defense highways, then let us make adequate provisions for them. I think this amendment does so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHERER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 4, line 18, strike out all the language beginning with the word "following" down to and including the word "system" in line 24 and insert "ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percentum of the sum authorized to be apportioned each year under this subsection."

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment provides that the \$200 million allocated for the interstate system be distributed on a population basis. I am going to repeat some of the things I said during the debate on the rule. The American Association of State Highway Officials, as I said before, recognizes that one of the most serious road problems in this country is the deplorable condition of the interstate system, which although it represents only 1 percent of the total road mileage in this country carries 20 percent of the traffic. These highway officials and the Department of Defense found that this system must be improved at once if it is to meet the future emergency needs and the present day commercial requirements of this country. They made an exhaustive study to determine how this system could best be improved. They came to the conclusion that the interstate system must be improved uniformly throughout the country. You cannot improve it in Colorado and in New Jersey and let it deteriorate in New Mexico. It must be a uniform improvement. It is not a question of miles or area. It is a matter of costs. The State highway officials of this country, who know more about highway problem than anyone else, proceeded to make a study on this basis. They determined the total cost necessary to bring this system up to the standards required to meet the defense needs of this country and also the commercial needs. They went further in this study and found out that the cost of doing this job in eight of the most populated States, is 51½ percent of the total cost, while the cost in the remaining 40 States is only 48½ percent of the total.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] forgets that you must take into consideration costs; that in the industrial areas or the highly populated States the average cost per mile of construction

of these interstate highways is 7½ times the cost in the rural areas. As I said before the highway officials of 46 States, each State having 1 vote, recommend to this Congress that we distribute all of this money for the interstate system on a population basis.

You have to consider that there is an additional \$600 million distributed on the old formula under which the so-called rural States get the break. They get a tremendous break on the distribution of the \$600 million otherwise provided for in this bill.

Lastly, if we do what the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] wants, we are going to have this result. The States where it costs 51½ percent of the total cost to do this job are going to get only 32.4 percent of the \$200 million. The States where the cost is only 48½ percent of the total cost are going to get 67.6 percent of the \$200 million. If we are going to do this job properly, as the State highway officials recommend and as the Defense Department says, you have got to distribute the \$200 million on a population basis.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendments.

Mr. Chairman, you can see what this committee has been going through for several months. I want to say in all sincerity that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] made an excellent statement in behalf of the rural areas. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] made an excellent statement in behalf of the urban areas. If we had enough money to give them both what they want, I am sure the chairman would have more friends. But this bill, after weeks of discussion, came out, as I have said, a compromise right down the middle; that is, \$200 million is authorized, \$100 million of it being distributed on the basis of population, as desired by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], and \$100 million distributed on the formula of one-third, one-third, and one-third, as suggested by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

I do not know of any fairer way to do it, and I hope that this committee will agree with the committee that has submitted this proposal that it is a fair distribution, because we recognize the needs of both and we cannot give either one of them all the money that they might wish.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the distinguished floor leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the chairman and all the members of the committee for the magnificent job they have done in bringing this bill before us. I think it is highly desirable from the standpoint of the interests of the country.

As to these amendments, what the gentleman has said is obviously correct. There are differences of opinion; but the committee, in my view, has done a good job of trying to work out a fair median balance. I agree with the gentleman that both of these amendments should be voted down.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I thank the distinguished floor leader. I might say that the district of the gentleman from Ohio would probably get more money if we were to base the distribution on population, but I am trying to be fair. We are distributing it one-half on the basis of population and one-half on the basis of the old formula—a compromise recognizing the needs and problems of both rural as well as urban areas.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it not a matter of fact that it was thoroughly discussed, that those gentlemen from the populous States could have taken the selfish point of view and insisted upon the full \$200 million being distributed on a basis of population? But in order to compromise the matter in committee and bring the bill to the floor we yielded in our view.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think the gentleman's statement is equally applicable to the members of the committee from rural districts. They, too, could have been selfish and asked for the \$200 million on the basis of area, but we agreed on 50 percent and that is what this legislation provides.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I want to call to the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee and also of the full committee that a number of us from the smaller States supported the amendment in the subcommittee and in the full committee. We are united in opposing both amendments presented here and hope the committee bill will be voted up.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Will the gentleman tell me whether his committee took any testimony bearing upon the question of grade-crossing eliminations?

Mr. MCGREGOR. No. We discussed grade-crossing eliminations as far as railroads and toll roads were concerned, but we made no change in the existing law relative to grade-crossing eliminations.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. That is the 1952 act provides that State highway commissions may in their discretion use some of these funds for this purpose, as I understand.

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. And this bill does not change that in any way.

Mr. MCGREGOR. We did not change it in any way; and I think that the committee will agree with me.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. OAKMAN. I agree with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR]. I would like very much to see the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio

[Mr. SCHERER] carried, for in my district we are building a hundred miles of the interstate system at a cost of \$8 million a mile, over a total cost of \$800 million. Out in the open country that is equivalent to 4,000 miles of road. So from the standpoint of equity I should have to go along with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], but realizing that good legislation is usually a matter of compromise I lend my voice to that of the chairman, hoping now that both of these amendments will be defeated, and that the committee bill will be approved.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I thank the gentleman very much.

I want to reiterate my hope that the substitute amendment offered by my friend from Ohio be defeated, as well as the amendment offered by my friend from Colorado so that we may go down the line and be equitable in the distribution of the funds authorized in this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Page 5, line 10, change the colon to a period and strike out all that follows through line 20.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I reluctantly approved the extension of the 2-cent-a-gallon Federal gasoline-tax rate enacted in 1951. I did this only because I was convinced that there was no other recourse. The extreme revenue needs of the Federal Government made it impossible to carry out the scheduled reduction in this tax.

However, I certainly cannot condone the clause in this bill, which would connect the Federal gasoline tax with the grants for the interstate-highway system.

The Federal gasoline tax is a general-revenue tax, imposed upon all uses of gasoline. It never has been in any way connected with highways or with the use of the highways.

A 1-cent-per-gallon tax was imposed in 1932 as a 1-year temporary emergency measure to balance the budget. It has been extended, reenacted, and increased for other general-revenue emergency purposes. In 1940 the tax was increased to 1½ cents a gallon to raise revenue for the national-defense buildup. In 1951 the rate went up to 2 cents as part of the series of tax increases prompted by the Korean war. The Ways and Means Committee has recommended that this 2-cent increase be continued to meet the present unavoidable revenue needs of the Federal Government.

It may be, and I am sure we all hope it will be, possible to reduce this tax as general revenue needs abate. But certainly I do not think it would be either proper or wise for us to nail this tax into the Federal highway-aid program. This

is my last year on the Committee on Ways and Means. It is the prerogative of the Ways and Means Committee to recommend tax rates to Congress. I do not see how the committee can continue to exercise that prerogative if other committees attempt to link certain taxes with certain programs and specify the rates.

Regardless of what the situation of the country might be or the desires of Congress, some people might contend that we would be bound by the terms of this bill to retain the Federal gasoline tax at 2 cents per gallon at least until September 30, 1955, and that the alternative would be to strip the Federal-aid program of grants for the vital interstate highway system.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal tax on gasoline is not a highway tax either in intent or in effect. Gasoline is not strictly a fuel for highway vehicles. It is used in aviation, in motorboats, in industry, in tractors and other farm machinery.

Take the situation in my State, for example. According to figures of the United States Bureau of Public Roads, nearly 220 million gallons of gasoline were consumed in Iowa for nonhighway purposes during 1952. That means the Federal gasoline tax costs the people of my State more than \$4 million a year on motor fuel that is not consumed on the highways at all. Furthermore, the Bureau reports that nearly a hundred and ninety-nine million of these gasoline gallons were consumed by farmers in agricultural machinery and equipment used off the highways.

The figures will vary but the facts will be the same for any State that has aviation, boating, factories, or farms.

If we break with precedent and tradition by linking the Federal gasoline tax with any part of Federal highway aid, we will be ignoring the true nature and uses of gasoline. We will be creating a precedent that could bring increasing demands upon us to link other taxes with other Federal programs until at last Congress is deprived of all initiative in the establishment of tax rates.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the full implications of this provision in the bill be seriously weighed. It serves no useful purpose and carries a potential for enduring harm. That is why I believe this amendment to strike that clause out of the bill merits our wholehearted approval.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman, of course, is speaking for the deletion of this provision having to do with the 2-cent gasoline tax. The gentleman is a very important member of the Ways and Means Committee. He is familiar with the fact that the Ways and Means Committee has reported legislation which will be considered on the floor this week providing under a closed rule for continuation of that half-cent excise tax. That was the sole reason, as I understand it, why this provision was written into the pending bill in the beginning.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(At the request of Mr. PRIEST, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. COLMER. I will ask the gentleman if it is not true that we have every reason to assume, the condition of the Treasury being what it is and the desire of the administration and others to balance the budget, that the other body will also continue that tax when it gets over there?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I expect it to be continued in this present bill.

Mr. COLMER. What we are doing here is setting a precedent, nailing this thing down, linking up the tax with Federal aid to roads?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The gentleman is correct. As I have stated here, much of the gasoline is used on the farm and off the highways. There is no logic in tying that tax to the road. I might add that I fought against the automotive tax increase in 1951 also, and that yields almost as much money or practically the same amount of money as the gasoline tax. I do not know how this committee happened to single out the gasoline tax to tie down for a specific use. I take it it would be just as logical to include the other taxes that are connected with the use of highways. I have always fought against all such earmarking very strongly.

Mr. COLMER. Is there any question in the distinguished gentleman's mind that once this gets into this bill and becomes a part of the legislation but what it will remain there for the rest of the time as permanent legislation?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes, and it will be used as leverage against future action by the Committee on Ways and Means or subject that committee to the charge that they are exercising jurisdiction over road building policies if they lower the tax rate on gasoline hereafter.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I agree with the gentleman in the serious question he raised about this. I would like to ask: Does the language there serve any good purpose? Without it, you will still have the same road program, and without it the House will still get an opportunity to act affirmatively on the gasoline tax in the other bill, is that not correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The gentleman is correct, absolutely. The adoption of this amendment will not cut down the authorization at all. It only cuts out the provision tying it to a specific excise tax, which provision does not serve any good purpose.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I notice my distinguished friend was commenting relative to the other body. We hate to lose him, but we hope he goes to the Senate. But, let me call his attention to this fact. He

does not know and neither does the present speaker know what they are going to do in the other body. My distinguished friend stated that he was always opposed to this half-cent additional tax. I might ask him, is this his way of trying to do away with the half-cent tax?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. No, this is one of the ways that we might avoid unfair pressure on the Committee on Ways and Means if that committee gives further consideration to a change in the gasoline tax.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Had the committee not voted out the bill, I am sure that is true, but that bill was voted out, so all we are doing now is saying "Give us the revenue and we will give you the roads." I would like to ask the gentleman if we do away with this half-cent tax, where are we going to get the money for those roads?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the gentleman will agree that this is an authorization bill. Now, when you come along with an appropriation for these funds for highway purposes, are you certain that a conditional authorization is going to be sufficient to secure the appropriation? As you well know, a point of order can be made against an appropriation that is not authorized by law. Now you are raising the question about a conditional authorization for an appropriation. The purpose here is to carry on the Federal-State highway program. When you impose a condition of this type, you are establishing a new precedent that might serve to cause difficulty in the future.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will say that we possibly are establishing a precedent, because we are going to assure the highway users that we are going to spend the money that they pay as a tax on gasoline on roads. That is a precedent.

Mr. COOPER. Why not bring in a bill to that effect? Why jeopardize your Federal-aid highway program by having a questionable provision of this type included in an authorization bill?

Mr. MCGREGOR. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means made the statement awhile ago in which he took exactly the opposite view of the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot agree upon a limitation of time on this amendment and all other amendments to the bill. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto terminate in 10 minutes.

Mr. WITHROW. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I shall object, if the gentleman will recall I asked him for time during general debate and I was allocated 3 minutes, and finally I could not use that. I want 5 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock, which will allow 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the general debate I tried to find out whether or not there was linkage in this bill between this authorization bill and the tax on gasoline. I was assured there was none. If there is not linkage with the gas tax, there certainly is a very well prepared system of cross-reference. This debate well illustrates what happens when you tie in an authorization bill with a particular tax. What we have been debating here today is not so much the need for this Federal aid to highways as where the money is coming from. Thus provisions of the bill have been tied in time after time with the gas tax. It is a function of the Committee on Public Works to authorize needed highway aid. It is up to the Appropriations Committee to find the money.

Once you say that all of the tax from a given source shall be used for highways, it immediately follows that then only the tax from that source will be used for highways. The result is immediately that you cannot meet the needs. The result in this case would be that you could use the gas tax only for highways, and then you would either have to increase the gas tax or let the highways be neglected or, if the gas tax is repealed, cut out Federal aid entirely.

This linkage should not be written into law. If you write it into law in this bill, you will be writing it into law for the first time and setting a definite precedent.

The Federal gas tax is not a tax based on user. This linkage means that in the highway program those from the most populous sections will pay through the gas tax to build highways in the less populous States. Perhaps people would prefer to pay it through the income tax. It would undoubtedly be more equitable. They do not doubt that these highways should be built, but this is a basic question which should not be discussed on a bill like this. We have listened all day to a discussion about interstate highways and the primary duty of the Federal Government to contribute to the cost of construction of such interstate highways. We have been told that the Federal Government has a duty to build these interstate highways, and that we are in crying need of building them, but then the provision this amendment would strike says the Federal Government cannot and will not discharge that duty unless it continues to receive income from the 2-cent gas tax. There could be no more effective argument against linking our Federal-aid program to a particular tax. The principle of linking the gas tax with aid for roads is entirely wrong. It should not be considered in this bill.

The bill is a fine bill otherwise. I compliment the chairman of the committee on it and the chairman of the subcommittee, who have worked very hard to bring this bill out. It is a very excellent job. But let us not set a precedent which

may adversely affect our highway program by putting this linkage provision into the bill.

The only reason given for this provision that I have heard is that it will force the other body to vote for extension of the 2-cent gas tax. This result it will not accomplish. But it goes further. It is a direct blow aimed at our many State Governors, who have advocated that the Federal Government get out of the gas-tax field. By this linkage you say to them in effect, "Give up your ideas or you will lose 200 million a year for interstate highways."

The Federal gas tax was never designed to be used only for roads. It should not be so restricted. Nor should the responsibility of the Federal Government for highways be limited to the extent of the revenue that is received from a gas tax, if any.

The gentleman from Ohio asked what the Senate will do with the excise tax. I say the first thing the Senate will do is take this provision out of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]. It is not necessary for me to recapitulate the arguments these gentlemen have used. They seem to me completely sound.

The use of gasoline is not confined to highways. It would be perfectly logical to say that the proceeds of the gasoline tax should be used for the construction of airports since airplanes use gas. It would be perfectly logical to say that the proceeds of the gasoline tax should be used for harbor improvements, because harbor improvements are utilized by vessels, and vessels nowadays are fueled predominantly by gasoline.

Further, I think it is a thoroughly pernicious precedent to have an attempt made to have one committee of the Congress coerce another committee of the Congress in this way.

I think we ought to vote on highway legislation in a highway bill and on excise tax legislation in a tax bill, appropriately reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Would it not be just as logical for the gentleman and me and other members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which tomorrow will bring before the House a bill authorizing some appropriations for the hospital construction act, to require that certain revenues from certain excise taxes be used for that purpose insofar as establishing a precedent is concerned?

Mr. HALE. Of course, the whole idea of earmarking, sometimes called dedication, seems to me completely false. Or to take another example, you might say that the automobile excise tax should be used entirely on highways. No proposition of that kind has been made. I have not myself seen the bill, which will be here on Wednesday from the Committee on Ways and Means. Neither I

nor anybody else knows what the House will do on that measure, still less what will be done on the measure in the other Chamber or by the Chief Executive.

I append certain telegrams recently received on this legislation:

AUGUSTA, MAINE, March 6, 1954.

HON. ROBERT HALE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building:

Maine State Grange has repeatedly urged withdrawal of Federal Government from field of gasoline taxation. New Federal Aid Highway Act making portion of Federal aid dependent on continuance of tax at 2-cent level contrary to policy of both National and Maine State Grange. Urge your strong opposition to portion of H. R. 8127 linking Federal aid with motor-fuel tax.

MAYNARD C. DOLOFF,
Master, Maine State Grange.

AUGUSTA, MAINE, March 8, 1954.

Representative ROBERT HALE,
House Office Building:

We urge you to oppose highway-aid legislation which would tie appropriations to Federal gasoline tax revenue. Federal gasoline tax should be eliminated and left to States and Federal aid to highways should be continued because of national defense, mail delivery, interstate commerce, and general welfare. These are not responsibilities of highway uses alone but of all the people. Farmers can see no reason to pay Federal tax on gasoline used in farming operations.

MAINE FARM BUREAU ASSOCIATION,
C. WILDER SMITH, President, Cutler,
Maine.

PORTLAND, MAINE, March 5, 1954.

HON. ROBERT HALE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We earnestly request your consideration of our views on H. R. 8127, proposed Federal Aid Highway Act. Section 2A, page 4, printed bill calls for earmarked funds for national system of interstate highways which we have long advocated and hope you will support. Section 2A, page 5, calls for 60 percent matching share for same funds. We urge that this be increased to 75 percent. Same section and page makes earmarked interstate authorization available only if present 2-cent Federal gas tax continued. This involves linkage and is highly undesirable. It would also make Federal-highway aid legislation contingent on tax legislation handled by different congressional committee and would adversely affect urban highway planning. May we have your views.

Thanks.

MAINE AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION,
ARLYN E. BARNARD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]. I believe that if we do not adopt the amendment we will be doing that which every Congress since 1932 scrupulously avoided doing. In 1932 the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means on double taxation had this to say. This was in December of 1932:

When the gasoline tax was first discussed in the House of Representatives, it was felt by many that this field of taxation was fully occupied by the States and should be left to them. The House did not include this tax in the revenue bill as transmitted to the Senate. The Senate, however, in the light of later figures as to deficit and as

to the probable tax yield, was obliged to amend the bill by including a tax upon gasoline, and that was accepted by the House.

Then, the following year, during the hearings on the Federal gasoline tax, when it was being considered by the House Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable Robert J. Doughton, who was then chairman of the committee, had this to say. This was in 1933. I quote:

This was an emergency tax measure. I am sure the Congress was reluctant to propose a tax on gasoline, but in order to balance the budget, the Congress felt it was necessary temporarily to impose a tax of 1 cent a gallon on gasoline over the objection of the House. It was passed in the Senate, and we concurred in it because they said the whole structure of government would perish if the budget was not balanced, and we were, too, anxious to balance it, and, consequently, in the rush of the close of the session of Congress and to balance the budget, we imposed the gasoline tax.

Despite the good intention of the Congress that imposed this temporary tax on gasoline, it was not permitted to expire on schedule. In 1933, the new Congress extended the tax, again on a temporary basis only, and increased its rate to 1½ cents per gallon as part of the National Industrial Recovery Act. Again, there was no pretense that this was a road tax; it was a general revenue tax. The additional one-half cent tax was permitted to expire on December 31, 1933, so the rate reverted to 1 cent per gallon. From then until July 1940, the tax was reimposed again and again at that rate, in order to meet the emergency requirements of a continuing depression.

In 1940 the tax was once more increased to 1½ cents a gallon. The Nation was recovering from the depression; but we now faced the necessity of building our military strength. The tax increase was for this avowed purpose. This tax money was needed for general-fund purposes, and there was no allegation that it was for the purpose of highway aid.

From 1940 until 1951 the tax continued at the 1½-cent rate. The fact that normal highway construction halted completely during the war years and regular Federal highway aid was suspended, serves to emphasize that the Federal gasoline tax had no connection with Federal highway aid.

In November 1951 the Federal gasoline tax was boosted to its present rate of 2 cents per gallon. Here again, the tax increase was not alleged to be for highway aid, but rather as a part of a schedule of general tax increases to raise revenue for the stepped-up defense program occasioned by the Korean war.

The history of the Federal gasoline tax speaks for itself. It shows beyond any possible question that this is and has always been a straight out general revenue tax, imposed and increased to meet general governmental emergencies. This is further emphasized by the fact that the tax applies not only to highway use of gasoline but to all gasoline, including that used in industry and agriculture.

It is a distortion of history to claim that there has ever been the slightest connection between Federal taxation of gasoline and Federal highway aid to the States. It is not only erroneous but even dangerous to suggest that the Federal gasoline tax be linked with future Federal highway aid to the States. The linkage theory upsets the very principle of Federal highway aid and jeopardizes its continuance on a sound basis.

One warning to this effect comes from the Honorable Wilburn Cartwright, who was chairman of the House Roads Committee from 1934 to 1943 and who, along with Senator CARL HAYDEN, was coauthor of a succession of Federal highway aid acts. In 1940, Representative Cartwright made a statement that offers food for reflection to all who espouse Federal gasoline tax linkage. He said:

The participation of the Federal Government in the improvement of highways in cooperation with the States, using general Treasury funds therefor, is amply justified on the grounds of . . . national defense, post roads, and interstate commerce. When the first Federal Aid Road Act was passed in 1916, neither the States nor the Federal Government had levied any special taxes, commonly known as road-user taxes, such as the taxes on gasoline, lubricating oils, and motor vehicles.

I think it is important that these broader reasons for justifying Federal participation in highway construction be not even tacitly abandoned by road advocates by putting too much emphasis on the relationship between road authorizations and road-user tax revenues. There might come a time when these taxes would not be levied, but that would not, in my opinion, remove the justification for further Federal participation in road improvements.

It will be noted that Representative Cartwright mentioned Federal taxes on lubricating oil and motor vehicles, as well as the tax on gasoline. As a matter of fact, there is a whole series of Federal excises on automobiles, trucks and buses, parts and accessories, tires and tubes—which produce over a billion dollars a year in revenue over and above the \$935 million yielded by the Federal gasoline and diesel fuel taxes.

Like the Federal gasoline tax, these automotive excises have no connection whatever with the Federal aid highway program. Like the Federal gasoline tax, they are emergency general excises which have been raised and lowered from time to time without any reference whatever to highway aid grants.

The nature of all these taxes underlines the lack of logic in singling out the Federal tax on gasoline as a highway tax. This fuel is used in farm tractors, boats, stationary engines and aircraft, as well as in vehicles using the highways. The Federal tax is paid on nonhighway use as well as highway use.

The linkage theory logically means that the gasoline tax would become a highway use tax—it means that non-highway use of gasoline should be exempt from the tax. In the interests of justice, the Federal Government would be obligated to refund the tax on all gasoline used for nonhighway purposes, such as in industry and agriculture. Besides reducing receipts from

the tax, this would add enormously to collection costs. It would require the creation of another Federal bureau to process the enormous volume of refund applications.

Consumers who use gasoline on farms and in factories would be burdened with the complex report filing essential to running a tax refund system.

But this would be only one problem of many brought on by tax linkage. With a stepped-up program of Federal highway aid, linked to Federal gasoline tax receipts, it is easy to foresee endless bickering over Federal-aid allocation formulas.

The densely populated, heavily traveled States would demand Federal grants equal to the gasoline tax money collected within their borders. The States with large areas and sparse populations would continue to expect larger-than-average grants because the original purpose of Federal highway aid was to help them most of all. And this would be only the beginning of the problem. Political subdivisions within each State would be making their demands, too.

A linkage of Federal excise taxes with Federal aid for highways will place Congress in the position of a glorified road commission which will be required to act as referee between the repeated and continuous demands of the several States as well as the political subdivisions within each of the States. Linkage, which on the surface appears to be an easy way out, would create many more problems than it solves. In fact, it would be the beginning of a succession of problems where the referee will never make a decision to the liking of the participants, and the decision will be reappealed and reargued every 2 years. Linkage is not the solution to the problem; rather, it will be the beginning of a multitude of new problems.

If this linkage theory is ever accepted, it will establish a precedent for a rash of other proposals to link other Federal taxes with specific beneficiaries for each tax collected by the Government. Congress has enough problems without borrowing more of them by adopting the linkage theory.

These facts support only one conclusion: Federal gasoline tax linkage is not a program or principle. It is a gigantic fallacy—unfounded in fact and unworkable in practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I am going to try to get away from the subject of the particular tax involved because I feel the danger here is the precedent which is being set of trying to tie one particular tax in with any particular purpose. In fact, I question whether it is constitutional to do such a thing. This is just a method of getting around a very basic constitutional provision which as I read it says that taxes may be raised for general revenue purposes. I submit that if you tie it to this, you are going to tie it to other things as we go along, and we are going to disrupt our whole system of taxation completely.

I should like to make one other suggestion to the Committee on Public Works. Although they might think they were putting pressure on the Committee on Ways and Means, it will work in the opposite way because this is, in effect, turning over to the Committee on Ways and Means the power of saying whether or not you are going to have your highway program. Let us not tie in any more taxes with specific programs to give to the Ways and Means Committee additional power. We already have unemployment insurance and social security because this procedure was followed. As a member of that committee I do not believe we want to get into the business of providing roads and of making decisions in this field. I suggest that this amendment be approved and that in the future we do not attempt to tie any particular tax in with a particular program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me if we do not adopt the committee proposal we are going to do one of two things. We are going to turn down this expanded highway program or else we are going to create a larger deficit in the Federal budget. It resolves itself into something just as simple as that, as far as I am concerned.

During the past several years we have had a diversion of the use tax which in most States they think is to be used on their State and national highway system. It has amounted to between \$400 and \$500 million a year for the last several years. If we, as Members of Congress, had been doing our duty over a period of years, we would have seen to it that that money went back on the highways because the figures show that we have killed more people on our highways in the last 20 years than were killed in our wars. It means that we are not staying on top of our job. I hope the committee will stay with the Committee on Public Works in this proposal, and perhaps we can work out something better 2 years from now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

(Mr. MCCORMACK, by unanimous consent, yielded his time to Mr. HAYS of Arkansas.)

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to take any time at all but, as a minority member of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, I have been impressed with the fact that students of this problem, who are primarily interested in the point of view of the States, are universally opposed to the principle of linkage of the gasoline tax and Federal authorizations. The chairman of the subcommittee has done an excellent job with this bill, and I am for it, and I would not say anything derogatory of the bill as a whole. But I think we could improve this legislation, and I trust that the chairman of the subcommittee will not feel that those of us who offer criticism on this point fail to appreciate the splendid work that has been done by the Public Works Commission. It would set a thoroughly bad precedent if we should adopt the idea of

linkage, which could spread to other types of legislation.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the logic of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is irrefutable, and that we will be perfecting this legislation to eliminate the principle of linkage and stick strictly to a Federal-aid program extending to all phases of highway legislation. For that reason I shall support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have not given a great deal of attention to the merits of this particular amendment. I would like to say just a few words as to the overall meaning of this bill.

It has been testified here today that we lose on our highways annually 33,300 people and that the financial loss is \$3,950,000,000, owing to the inadequacy of our highways. It was also testified, I think by our colleague from the State of Washington, that two-fifths of this loss, both in human life and in property, is due to the inadequacy of our highway system.

Breaking these figures down to date it is something like this: Our financial loss is \$3,950,000,000 per year due altogether to this inadequacy. In 2 years—and we are making this appropriation for 2 years—it is double that, or \$7,950,000,000. These are losses we are dealing with, losses due to inadequacy that this House admittedly is responsible for. Let us think of it, Mr. Chairman. That means that every day, this day in which are living here and discussing this bill 36 people are being killed on our highways on account of things that we have failed to do; that is two-fifths of the entire number. One hundred and more were killed yesterday and today and will be killed tomorrow.

I have heard the argument put forth that there is not enough road equipment in existence to make use of a larger appropriation. I submit that that problem will shortly be solved once an appropriation shall be made. How long, Mr. Chairman, do you suppose it would be if Congress were to double the appropriation proposed in this bill until the manufacturers of road-building equipment would call back on the job the thousands of men recently dismissed from employment? How long would it be until additional facilities for manufacture would be under construction? There is no avenue of increasing business actively and consequent employment equal to this opportunity in existence, because it will result in the immediate saving of human life and property.

I favor the passage of this bill, but I regret that no member of the committee has seen fit to introduce an amendment to double or treble the amount of money to be appropriated. I am convinced the American people would heartily approve such a measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, if this bill had come to the floor next Wednesday and the bill from the Committee on Ways and Means had been on

the floor today, it is quite possible that all the debate and argument we have listened to would not have been heard at all.

As I stated earlier in the day, the half-cent a gallon gasoline tax yields \$225 million a year. If that be not reenacted it means that the income instead of being \$906 million a year would be about \$700 million. Then if this bill be enacted at \$875 million we would far exceed all of the income from the gas tax.

We are saying to the people of this country by this provision—call it linkage if you will—we want to give you good roads; we want to take the money that you paid for using the roads and spend it on the highways—I mean the gas tax that you pay for the gasoline you buy, we want to take it and spend it on the roads. You cannot spend it if you do not pay it; you cannot spend it if this bill is not passed, to continue the two-cent a gallon tax. The one question that is involved, and that is the old controversy, namely, if you want roads then provide the money to pay for them. If you do not link the half-cent gas tax but still enact this bill you have a spread of \$450 million throwing the budget out of balance more than ever before because the income from such tax would be \$225 million less while the bill provides \$225 million more for roads.

What is wrong with this language? What harm does it do? Should the tax bill be passed as recommended, the language sought to be stricken out would be meaningless. We accomplished what we seek to do—morally to indicate that the money which comes from the gas tax shall be used for the building of roads; but we must have the tax continued if we are to have better highway facilities.

For the reasons stated—I will not take more time, Mr. Chairman—I ask that the amendment be voted down and call for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARTIN of Iowa) there were—ayes 70, noes 70.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DONDERO and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 80, noes 93.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NICHOLSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8127) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 460, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk, in engrossing the bill H. R. 8127, be authorized to capitalize the word "commerce" on page 3, line 5, to correct a typographical error.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

HOURLY OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, there are no special orders granted for tomorrow after the conclusion of the day's business. I trust that we can, if possible, avoid any special orders because we, on our side, desire to have a conference after the bill is disposed of tomorrow.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was granted permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. VAN PELT asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXCISE TAX ON AUTOMOBILES

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the automobile today is as necessary to the average workingman as his dinner pail. On Wednesday of this week the House will have before it H. R. 8224, the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954. This brings up a measure which in one of its elements contains a gross inequity. This inequity will have a direct material bearing on 1 out of every 7 productive workers in this Nation. This is the number of workers it is said receive their paycheck directly or indirectly from the automotive industry. I believe that, when this inequity is clearly pointed up to the committee, the only course of action would be for the Ways and Means Committee, through its chairman, to offer or accept an amendment to rectify the injustice.

I am speaking of the continuation of the 10-percent excise-tax rate on passenger cars and the 8-percent excise tax on trucks, buses, trailers, parts and accessories. As it is generally known, by law the excise tax on passenger cars was to have been automatically reduced from 10 percent to 7 percent and on trucks, buses, trailers, parts and accessories from 8 percent to 5 percent on April 1. These 3 percentage points were added to the excise tax on these commodities in 1951. It was clearly recognized by the Congress at that time that these were excessive, temporary rates that in all equity should be reduced when this country was no longer on an extreme emergency basis.

Not only does this bill continue this exorbitant tax but it performs the additional injustice of not establishing a definite cutoff date when such increases will be eliminated.

It has been said that the existence of a termination date on an excise tax in an act of Congress only invites a buyers' strike. An example has been cited to the effect that automobile dealers today have organized to stop accepting deliveries from manufacturers simply because the tax was scheduled to go down April 1. Mr. Speaker, I contend that the simple solution to this phase of a buyers' strike can be accomplished by including in the bill a provision for an automatic refund to the dealers of stocks on hand as of the effective date of the reduction in tax. This has been the case historically upon the termination or reduction of excise taxes.

The question logically follows then, Would there not be a public buyers' strike as opposed to a dealers' buyer strike? The Ways and Means Committee in its report has clearly stated that it is its intention to take another look at the rates on these items next year. Surely the existence of this intention would have as serious an effect on the buying public as the existence of a termination date in the act itself.

In the first session of the 83d Congress, I introduced a bill calling for the complete elimination of excise taxes on the items under discussion—H. R. 3186. I still believe that such action

is prudent and proper. Automotive excise taxes are unfair to millions of workers, particularly to the lower-income group who comprise more than 75 percent of the passenger-car owners. They are discriminatory against makers and owners. This is true because the tax is so highly selective and departs from the normal concept of uniformity of treatment. Excise taxes represent a threat to demand and employment. The automobile in our economy is clearly not a luxury but has been proven definitely to be a necessity. The universal high rate of use testifies to this point. As of mid-1953 there was 1 passenger car for every 4 persons in this country or 1 car for every 1.1 families.

Clearly a strong case can be made for the elimination of excise taxes on automotive items, but I am not politically naive enough to think that this action is practicable to the extent of full accomplishment or realization at the moment. Rather, I will content myself with the argument that the inequity and injustice contained in this bill should be corrected here and now. Surely the arguments for repeal speak eloquently for such correction.

Actually, this represents an inequity heaped on injustice since this same bill provides for a drastic reduction in the excise tax on luxury items. At the same time, an exorbitant rate is continued, not reduced, on automotive items, which are clearly not luxury items. Historically, excise taxes were imposed on automotive items in periods when their purchase was being discouraged because of shortage of materials. Surely, no such argument can be made today and it should be abundantly clear that an incentive rather than a detriment should be given to this vital industry.

We have heard much of an endeavor to obtain a uniform excise or manufacturer's tax on all items produced. The reduction of all excise taxes to a common level, namely, 10 percent, contained in this bill begins to look like a move in the direction of a standard excise tax. Can it be that this is the basic reason for the refusal to accept a termination date on these 3 percentage points on automotive items? If so, surely this is not the proper solution to this problem. Such a tax must be measured in the light of all the circumstances and in totality, and then only with due deliberation.

It is, therefore, my contention that the Committee should adopt an amendment to this bill, H. R. 8224, which would provide for the automatic reduction not later than April 1, 1955, of the tax on passenger cars from 10 percent to 7 percent, and on trucks, buses, trailers, parts, and accessories, from 8 percent to 5 percent. In addition, this amendment should provide that stocks of such items in the hands of dealers on said date will be the subject of a tax refund.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS ON FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1954

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of the Mississippi River Parkway legislation, I am happy to know that the Committee on Public Works has included an authorization of \$250,000 in the bill before us today to assist the States in expediting the planning of the Great River Road.

This great riverside highway following the Mississippi River from its source to the sea will not only welcome travelers seeking history and scenery but it will link Minnesota and the Gulf of Mexico with a defenseway through the heart of our continent. With agriculture and industry thriving along the river, there is a steadily growing need for such a midcontinent thoroughfare.

The splendid record of Federal-State cooperation which has marked all of the planning by the 10 great States bordering the Mississippi River is one unequaled in my experience in the Congress. By following present State highways, we will have an economical thoroughfare that will benefit both the States and the Federal Government. It will raise these highways to modern standards for interstate travel that will serve both national commerce and national defense. It will be at once a farm-to-market road, a scenic and historic parkway, and a modern trunk thoroughfare linking the 35 million people of the river States. As the Mississippi River has always served the heartland of the North American Continent, so too, will the great river road serve our agriculture and our commerce.

The Mississippi River Parkway Planning Commission deserves to be commended for its constant spirit of cooperation and the single-mindedness with which it has worked to make this remarkable project possible. It includes 10 members appointed by each of the 10 governors of the States bordering the Mississippi and it has given us a plan worthy of our support.

The people of the river States have long wanted a scenic interstate highway that will open the Mississippi Valley to the thousands of tourists each year who want to see America first.

In Minnesota, as in other States, the tourist trade is a rapidly expanding industry and an interesting and safe highway along the river will surely be one of America's great attractions. The river and the valley are rich in history and in a variety of scenery unequaled in our country.

At the same time it will help our State to modernize the highway system that is the midcontinent artery of our transportation system. It will connect the rich and varied agricultural areas and rural towns with the centers of industry into which their raw materials flow.

The recreation potential of the Mississippi Valley is almost unlimited and a safe modern highway will open new possibilities in every State.

In my own congressional district, the highway will offer travelers easy access to the historical and scenic cities and towns and farmlands along the river. Following is a brief summary of some of the sights to be seen in our district:

Aitkin: In this vicinity the Mississippi River runs through land which was once the floor of Lake Aitkin, a large and ancient body of water formed behind the terminal moraine of the Keewatin ice sheet. The sandy plain of the old lake is now a prosperous farming area devoted largely to dairy products, turkeys, and small fruits.

West of Aitkin the present roads run through a pleasant country of mixed farm and forest. In the spring this region is noted for the vivid coloring of the wildflowers which grow in roadside meadows and swamps.

Crosby, Ironton: In the vicinity of these towns is the Cuyuna Iron Range. Parkway travelers would be able to visit some of the mines, including the immense open-pit manganiferous ore mine which lies near the Mississippi River north of Crosby. The river here runs broad and deep between sandy banks. Dense second-growth forests, edged with brilliant wildflowers, grow to the very brink of the low banks.

Brainerd: This town is the gateway to an extensive recreation area. When the glaciers retreated from this region, great outwash streams deposited sand and gravel around and on top of huge blocks of ice. When the ice melted, pits were left in the terrain which filled with water and became lakes. North of Brainerd a series of these pit lakes—Gull Lakes, Long Lake, Whitefish Lakes, and others—forms the setting for some of Minnesota's best-known resorts. East and south of Brainerd is Mille Lacs Lake, another resort center. When the French first entered the upper Mississippi area toward the end of the 17th century they found many important Sioux towns on the shores of this lake. Both De Luth and Hennepin visited the principal Sioux village of Izatys. The lodges of present-day Indians are seen in numbers along the highways around the lake.

In the Brainerd vicinity and for many miles to the south modern highways paralleling the Mississippi to the east traverse a broad, sandy plain, marked by occasional groups of dunes. This Anoka sand plain, as it is known to geologists, was formed by wash from the Mississippi River as it pushed westward against the retreating Grantsburg sublobe of glacial ice.

Crow Wing River: A short distance below Brainerd the Mississippi is joined by its first large tributary, the clear and beautiful Crow Wing, which drains a large area of forest, farm, and lake. Near its mouth one branch of the Red River trail, over which the squeaking oxcarts made their annual journeys between Canada and the Twin Cities, crossed the Mississippi. Fur-trading posts and the vanished frontier town of Old Crow Wing were situated near the confluence of the two streams.

Fort Gaines site: On the west bank of the Mississippi, about midway between

the Crow Wing and Little Falls, stands the weathered ruin of an old brick powder magazine, all that remains to mark the site of Fort Gaines—later called Fort Ripley—a military post occupied between 1849 and 1878.

Camp Ripley: An active military reservation where Minnesota's National Guard receives its field training.

Little Falls: A modern dam largely obscures the rapids in the Mississippi, once well-known landmarks to explorers and French voyageurs. A short distance northeast of the city is Hole-in-the-Day's Bluff, named for an Ojibway chief said to have been slain by his own people and buried on the summit.

Charles A. Lindbergh State Memorial Park: This tract of 110 acres on the west bank of the Mississippi was dedicated by the State of Minnesota to the memory of Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh, who was associated with pioneer liberal movements in the State, and who was prominent in the Non-Partisan League and the Farm-Labor Party. The clapboard-covered cottage in which he lived for many years and which was the boyhood home of his famous son, the "Flying Colonel," is preserved as a museum. The park contains one of the finest remaining stands of virgin white pine and affords facilities for picnicking and hiking.

Pike's Fort site: Here on the sandy bluff overlooking the river, Lt. Zebulon M. Pike built a stockade for his exploring party during the winter of 1805-06.

South of Little Falls existing roads, sometimes unpaved, enable the traveler to follow quite closely along the west bank of the Mississippi as far as Minneapolis. Occasionally the tops of the sandy bluffs afford striking views of the blue river and the terraces—frequently wooded—which characterize the opposite bank. Although largely farmland, the country presents a diversified scene. In the spring the wildflower displays are outstanding. Occasional factories, dams, and crossings of tributary streams serve to give a pleasant variety to the landscape. Sites of early trading posts and missions are reminders of the days when the upper Mississippi was a wild frontier.

Sartell: A large pulp and paper mill is located directly on the riverbank here and probably would be open for inspection by parkway travelers.

St. Cloud: This prosperous city is the center of a famous quarrying region. The fine-grained granite found here has been used in the construction of some of the most impressive public and private buildings throughout the Nation. A pioneer log cabin built by Balthasar Rosenberger about 1855 is preserved in Riverside Park.

Oliver H. Kelley house: On the east bank of the Mississippi about 3 miles south of Elk River is the former farm and home of Oliver Hudson Kelley, founder of the National Grange of the Order of Patrons of Husbandry. Now owned and maintained by the Grange, this property would enable parkway travelers to visualize the development of a typical Minnesota homestead into a prosperous present-day farm. Here is the outstanding site in the Nation for telling the story of the movement for farmer organization.

THE MASK HAS BECOME THE MAN

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 13 years ago, in its February 1941 issue, Reader's Digest carried a story entitled "A Visit to Berchtesgaden."

The story opens at the peak of Hitler's victories in World War II. It tells of Joshua's visit to Hitler at Berchtesgaden and of Hitler's visit, through time, with Joshua to the famed trumpet and the crumbling walls of Jericho, 40 centuries ago.

The moral of the story appears to be that as you fight something, unless you are exceedingly careful, you are apt to absorb the spirit of what you fight, setting in train acts like those you sought to avoid.

Appalled at the slaughter and the misery he had seen at Jericho, Hitler tried to return to Berchtesgaden untainted. But it was too late. "The mask has become the man," said Joshua, "you cannot doff it."

Under unanimous consent, the article is cited below. I trust that it will be of some interest to the Congress in its current deliberations, especially in these days when so many people feel drained of strength and achievement and of purpose:

A VISIT TO BERCHTESGADEN

(By Hillel Bernstein)

(This seems to me the story of the year. To read it is a personal experience, and upon publication the story will become a national and international experience. It is more than literature. It is the contemporary mind coming to a great conclusion about one of the great contemporary problems. (Carl Van Doren.))

(HISTORICAL NOTE.—The World War of 1914-18 gave birth to the legend of the Unknown Soldier. After the World War which began in 1939 the despairing, mystical times brought forth a new legend, that of the Resurrected Soldier. He was expected hourly to return from the grave and liberate the enslaved peoples from the yoke of the Nazi conquerors.)

When Hitler felt the need for brooding mystically over some problem of state, he usually repaired to his mountain residence at Berchtesgaden, high above the Bavarian countryside. In such a mood he sat one evening in the private projection room of his mountain retreat, viewing again—for the hundredth time—the motion-picture record of his military triumphs.

He sat alone there, savoring with relish the striking power of his army and air force. The performance was ever a bracing tonic to the Führer. Having willed all these campaigns he also felt that he had achieved all this destruction personally. It was as if he, Hitler, had smashed Warsaw with a drive of his right fist, and had destroyed a square mile of buildings in the center of Amsterdam with a vigorous kick of his left boot. He drank it in greedily with his eyes.

No previous military leader in history had enjoyed the delights of being able to view his campaigns again whenever he pleased. Hitler reflected that Napoleon, or Caesar, or Alexander, would have envied him this precious advantage. Great as they were, they could not bring back the sights of their stirring, smashing triumphs. They could not

re-create, as he could, the scenes of power, victory, and glory.

Suddenly he felt a chill, and had a creepy feeling that he was not alone. He peered anxiously through the dark of the room. At the back there stood what seemed to be the figure of a huge man. Hitler's first instinct was to ring for his guards. But somehow his hand—the hand that had smashed Warsaw—was powerless to function.

"Who's there?" he said.

"I am a soldier," replied a low voice.

Hitler knew that this was no flesh-and-blood intruder. He was nervous and he played for time.

"Who let you in?" he demanded.

"I come from the past. No one let me in."

"Do not imagine that I am alone," Hitler cried. "The power of my invincible Reichswehr is about me. I am not unprotected."

"Yet now you are alone," the voice answered.

"What do you want?" Hitler's voice was thin and piping.

"For the present," came the answer, "I am looking at your battles."

"You said you were a soldier. What is your rank?"

"I am a commander."

Hitler became ingratiating. "A commander. Then you can study my battles with the eye of an expert. No doubt you can compare them with your own campaigns."

"My battles were different," said the other, curtly. A sense of superiority was evident in his manner but Hitler chose to ignore it.

"Naturally," he said. "All battles are different. A different general, a different kind of battle. And what were your battles like?"

"In most of them," said the stranger, "I spared no living thing."

Hitler's military vanity was piqued. "Do not try to talk to me in superior tones," he cried. "What scale were your campaigns on? Mine are on a world scale. Suppose I do leave a building standing here or there, or a few miserable enemies alive. Think of the immensity of my work. Military experts agree that there has been nothing like my wars in history. I have succeeded more than any other man—more than Napoleon, or Caesar, or Alexander. Who, then, are you?"

The other's voice indicated a cold fury; he, too, evidently had his military vanity. "You are going to see my battles," he said.

It was said ominously, and Hitler grew wary, remembering that he was facing an unknown danger. He said, in softer tones, "How can I see your battles? They are over and done with."

"No," was the answer. "They are still going on. I have fought them over again a thousand times. I will take you into the fighting, from the very beginning of my first campaign."

"I don't know what you mean," Hitler said, "and I cannot waste more time. I have many things to do."

The voice was freezingly contemptuous. "You are coming with me."

For the first time Hitler became clearly aware of the face. It was like nothing that he had known before: large, strong, hard-featured, expressionless, unearthly. But the eyes—the eyes. They were somehow like windows which widened out so that a world could be seen through them, a world of dooms and agonies.

Hitler felt drained of strength, achievement, fame, everything. Now the stranger's voice, as he spoke again, was inexorable. "Come with me," he said.

Hitler had a sudden feeling that he was in movement, and he struggled with all his might. But it was useless. In a moment he was out of Germany and out of his element.

They traveled on the wings of the past. They sped past the Napoleonic wars and the French Revolution, past the Thirty Years' War, past the Renaissance, and they did not even stop for the Middle Ages and the struggle between the emperors and the popes.

"Where are you taking me?" Hitler asked.

"Patience," said his fellow traveler. "I visited with you in modern times. You will visit with me in ancient times."

The Roman Empire went by like a flash, and the campaigns of Alexander the Great were just a flicker on the way. "That was Greek civilization just then," said the stranger, with a backward gesture. And then at last, "We have arrived."

Hitler found himself set down in rugged country, among warriors—hard, fierce, determined-looking men—many thousands of them gathered in an encampment. He watched his companion instantly take charge, as if he had not been away. He noted, too, from the moment of arrival, that there was a change in his companion. He looked smaller now, and without that terrifying atmosphere of doom which had characterized him at Berchtesgaden. He was more of a man and less of a shade. Although Hitler was in his power, the Führer did not fear his captor as much as he had a little while ago in the 20th century. Set in his own environment, the man was no more terrible than Hitler in his.

Immediately after his arrival there was an inspection of forces. Hitler went down the ranks with his companion, surveying the faces and military bearing of the soldiers. "Excellent fighting men," he said. "They remind me of some of my good sergeants in the Reichswehr." He spoke directly to one man, saying, "I should like to have had you for my good Reichswehr."

The man seemed to take no notice of this pretty speech, and Hitler said angrily to his companion, "Do you approve of your common soldiers behaving rudely to a visiting commander?"

"Forty centuries separate you from these men," was the reply. "They cannot see or hear you. You are not even dust in anyone's eye."

"Did you take me out of the 20th century in order to insult me?" Hitler complained. "I want to go back to the Reich, where I am in everyone's eye."

"You will go back soon," said the leader. "Meanwhile, there are battles to be viewed."

The inspection was followed by a council of war. The warriors, under the leadership of Hitler's companion, planned to invade new lands, slay all the inhabitants, and take their lands for themselves and their posterity. Hitler, the invisible one, listened to the plan of action.

"All, then, is in readiness," said the leader. "Wait," said Hitler. "As a commander I criticize your preparations as crude and amateurish. Your plan is incomplete."

"Speak on," said Hitler's companion.

Hitler said: "Where is your propaganda machine? Where are your grievances? Why haven't you proved first that your nationals over there are being persecuted? That the other side is plotting to attack you? Where are your frontier incidents? Your atrocities? You haven't even shown the foresight to colonize some people over there first, to be killed in atrocities at the right moment. What a bungled campaign."

"None of that is necessary," said the leader. "We do not have to justify ourselves. It is the Lord who has told us to take those lands."

"That's good about the Lord," Hitler admitted. "That's always good. God is with me, too."

Then he bethought himself of another piece of excellent counsel. "You've forgotten one very important move," he said. "You ought to prove first of all that your enemies are dominated by the Jews. By the Jewish warmongers, who have instigated them to fight against you. If you do that, you will always be a hero, no matter what else you do."

His companion smiled. "That won't be necessary, either," he said. "For, you see, we are the Jews."

Hitler gasped. He looked wildly about, at those fierce, hard faces, at those warriors

whose strength and soldierlike qualities he had admired. "But it's impossible," he cried. "Jews. But it can't be. And you yourself?"

"All of us."

"You're joking. I know what Jews are, and they're not fighters," he screamed. "Bankers, merchants, lawyers, doctors, tradesmen, journalists." He spat out his contempt. "Warmongers. They get others to do their fighting."

"These are the Jewish soldiers," said his companion, "and they will do their own fighting. Forty thousand of them are gathered here, and not an enemy will escape the edge of their swords."

Hitler was suddenly in panic. Forty thousand fighting Jews, and he alone among them, without a single army of 2 million to defend him. And the leader knew who he was. Already Hitler writhed in anticipation of being torn to pieces.

"You forget that they cannot see or hear you," said the leader, reading his thoughts.

Yet Hitler was sick. He sat down on a rock, and said feebly, "What is this place?"

"You are in the first chapter of the Book of Joshua of the Old Testament."

"In the Bible," groaned Hitler. "And you?"

"Joshua."

"The Bible. I had to listen to sermons from that when I was a boy. There was one about Joshua, the miracle soldier. Are you he who blew down the walls of Jericho?"

"You will see them blown down," said Joshua.

Then Hitler made a fighting effort to liberate himself from his environment. He stood up and shrieked: "No! No! I won't stay here in the Bible. I hate that book. I've got a book—my own book, *Mein Kampf*—and I want to go back to it. I want to go back to my German Reich and my German people."

His voice rose to a scream which he hoped would pierce the centuries, reach Berlin, arouse the Gestapo. "Help! Help! Germans to the rescue. I've been kidnaped by the Jews."

"They can't see or hear you in Berlin either," said Joshua. "There is no Berlin. It is still a marsh."

Hitler was forced to resign himself for the time being to the role of invisible spectator. The one satisfaction he enjoyed, as he looked at the fighting Jews, was his knowledge that in his day their descendants would constitute a minority that he could persecute and terrorize. At times he indulged in secret bravado. "Yah!" he jeered. "You capitalistic, bolshevistic, democratic, pacifistic, warmongering, trading, scribbling, pill-rolling, lawyering, banking Jews—yah!—you men of peace and good will, I despise you, I persecute you, I make you fear me. You tremble at the thought of me. I am the scourge." But no one heard him.

After a night of preparation and prayer, the army started on its campaign of invasion. The destination was Jericho and the first objective was the crossing of the river Jordan. To achieve the crossing swiftly and successfully, Joshua said that a miracle was in order, a miracle which would divide the waters. "Miracle," scoffed Hitler. "My army engineers create a miracle by spanning the river with pontoon bridges or rubber boats."

Hitler crossed the Jordan with Joshua as the waters divided. He was present at the siege of Jericho and he saw the walls come tumbling down at the final blast of the trumpets. It reminded him that he had blown down the bastion of Prague with a radio speech and the accompanying Nazi "Sieg Heil." "My voice, too," he said, "is the trumpet of destiny."

The walls came down, and Hitler watched the soldiers swarm over the debris and into the city with their swords flashing. It was slaughter and annihilation in the name of the Lord, who had instructed Joshua to spare no living thing.

Hitler had often dreamed of the annihilation of a foe to the last man. He had never seen his dream realized so completely as at Jericho. It sickened him.

Joshua, observing him, said, "It takes a strong stomach to do the Lord's work."

"What are you trying to insinuate?" said Hitler, touchily. "I never felt better in my life."

"You look woefully sick," said Joshua. "But you would be far sicker if you had to direct this slaughter over and over again a thousand times, as I have had to do."

The campaigns continued. Hitler watched the burning of Ai, and he saw the King of Ai hanged on a tree until eventide. For the first time he noticed a peculiar change in Joshua. The Jewish commander was indomitable, fiery, relentless; but there were moments in the midst of it all when he looked sad and weary and inconceivably old. Hitler happened to catch Joshua in his tent in one of those moments; the sight startled him.

"Go away," said Joshua, in a tired, weak voice.

"Where shall I go?" said Hitler. "You must take me back to my Reich."

"I can't do that until my campaigns are over," said Joshua.

"Then why did you bring me here in the first place?"

"Military pride," said Joshua. "I always feel that way at the beginning. But as the campaigns go on my spirit staggers under the burden. There is that within me which wants to cry out against the slaughter. But the words stop in my throat, and I cannot. I am powerless to change the course of the battle. And I feel every wound, every plunge of the sword, every slaying. It is the mass slaying of Joshua which I undergo. And it is Joshua who directs his own thousandfold slaying."

"I am not weak," said Hitler. "I do not sigh and falter at the sight of bloodshed."

"You have battles, too, which you will want to change later," said Joshua. "You, too, will be powerless."

"I will not want to change anything," said Hitler.

He was delighted to have caught Joshua in such a revealing moment; it made him feel superior and contemptuous. But if he believed this would continue as a permanent condition, he was disappointed. Joshua was again militant, again merciless. He marched against the coalition of the five kings, met their forces at Gibeon and slaughtered them. The 5 kings were hanged on 5 trees. At Azekah, Hitler saw the fleeing hordes of the enemy bombed with great stones from Heaven. There was another miracle that day, and this time Hitler was really impressed. It was getting towards evening and Joshua needed more daylight in order to complete the victory. He commanded the sun to stand still at Gibeon and the moon to remain in the valley of Ajalon.

The invasion and occupation of other lands continued, and Hitler watched the destruction of the Canaanites, the Amorites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites.

One part of the Jewish leader looked young and implacable, commanded the army and drove the soldiers on to triumph. The other part, aged, weary, sad, looked heavily on at the destruction. "The slaughter avails nothing," this second Joshua said. "The miracles avail nothing. They have to be paid for in misery."

Joshua had conquered completely and the children of Israel were in possession of the Promised Land. There was a great gathering of joy. All the victorious warriors were assembled to honor the man who had led them to victory. When Joshua appeared, the din was terrific.

Hitler, standing nearby, was assailed with nostalgia. This was the kind of applause he usually got in Germany, and it went to

his head like a powerful stimulant. It took fortitude not to respond.

Little by little, however, the faces faded out, the scene blurred; only the mass effect of a great celebration remained.

Joshua was addressing his soldiers. "With the help of the Lord," he was saying, "we have conquered. Now the children of Israel have the Promised Land. Let us worship the Lord and observe His Commandments, and we shall always enjoy the fruits of these victories—we and our children and our children's children."

There was another burst of applause, and this time Hitler, no longer aware of time and place, responded to it as automatically as if the applause came from a Nazi cheering section directed by Herr Goebbels. He bounded to the front of the platform, acknowledged the shouts of the warriors, and began to speak, pouring out his pentup emotions. "My German Soldier Comrades," he began. "This is a great hour in our history. The Lord has been with us, and we have conquered. The Lord told me to lead the Germans out of the wilderness of despair and the Versailles Diktat. The Lord told me to take the lands of the Czechs, the Poles, the Dutch, the Norwegians, the Danes, the Belgians, the French, the English, the Russians, the Americans. All these lands, He said, should be German lands, and those whom we do not annihilate should be our serfs—hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Germans."

"Now we have conquered, and now the world is ours. Now our German Reich embraces and dominates the earth, and we shall be the master race for the next 1,000 years. We Germans are the chosen people, chosen by God. The world must recognize that we are the chosen people and it must submit to our decisions and our government, for this universe is ours."

He went on and on, in a paroxysm of joy, and his body quivered as if he were experiencing the ecstasy of divine communication. But suddenly Joshua was at his side and leading him away.

"They did not hear a word, and cannot," said Joshua. "But I heard, and it is sufficient. And now, home to your Reich."

Again there was the sudden sense of motion. Just as speedily as they had traveled toward the times of Joshua, they now moved toward the times of Hitler. Almost immediately they were once more in the motion-picture projection room at Berchtesgaden. The film of Hitler's triumphs was still on the screen, and the scene as they entered showed a gathering of 200,000 Nazis shouting "Seig Heil."

"It is not true," said Hitler, "that no one heard me when I made that speech. Eighty-five million Germans heard me."

"So much the worse for them," said Joshua.

He was again a huge, formidable shape in the darkness, but Hitler no longer felt as disturbed as he had been at the beginning. "Eighty-five million triumphant, victorious people," cried Hitler, ecstatically, "The German master race. The rulers of the world."

"So be it," said Joshua. "You have declared yourselves a chosen people, and it is done. The Germans of your day are taking the place of the Jews of my day, and the Germans of a future day will take the place of the Jews of your day. It relieves us of a burden that has scarred us and borne us down, and which in adversity has made us the targets and scapegoats of all mankind. From now on you can have all the triumphs of a chosen people, and afterward, upon your downfall, you can have their persecutions, too. My Jews may rest at last. And I may rest."

"Whatever are you saying?" said Hitler. "Persecutions? Taking the place of Jews? What devilish nonsense is this?"

"You have been imitating the Jews of my time," said Joshua, and his voice ranged through the world with more volume than all the choruses of "Sieg Heil." "You have desired to be a chosen people, and now you have become one—self-chosen. I have been waiting 4,000 years for this day, waiting to be relieved of the painful punishment of fighting my battles over. And during that time I have seen the descendants of my Jews suffering the revenge of a world that remembered them once as chosen. But now, in the world's eyes, there is a new chosen people, a self-proclaimed one. Let them suffer when their time comes, while my people enjoy the delights of oblivion. My people have earned their rest."

Hitler looked into those window-eyes, and what he saw there affrighted him. Harassed Germans were there, weak and furtive, driven from pillar to post, with men lashing at them with whips while the mob jeered and showed its fangs of hatred. He sobbed and wept for the sight. Then he frantically fought off the illusion.

"No," he shrieked. "It is not so. We have not been imitating the Jews. We want to be nothing like them. Our destiny is a German destiny. Siegfried, not Joshua. We shall never know defeat and dispersion."

"You have seen what we were," said Joshua. "You may see what you will become."

Hitler put his hands over his eyes.

"It is not for nothing," said Joshua, "that in every plan of conquest you strove to identify your foes with the Jews; to make them Jews, no matter what they were in reality. Not for nothing have you fashioned the Jew into your world enemy. Deep down, deep in the spirit, an urge drove you. An urge to supplant the Jews. Not as they are today but in their ancient role."

"Outrageous and ridiculous," cried Hitler, full of hysteria. "I used the Jews as a propaganda weapon, yes—but with contempt. I made them my enemy, yes. I identified them with our foes, so that I could achieve what I wanted without opposition, because no one would dream of opposing me on behalf of the Jews. But what has that to do with imitation?"

"The mask has become the man," said Joshua. "You cannot doff it."

Hitler looked through those eyes again, and was appalled.

Joshua said, "When Moses placed his hand upon me and God instructed me, we were the chosen people. Thus imbued, I led my people in conquest of the Promised Land. No man in my lifetime could withstand me, no man and no people. We believed ourselves a chosen people, and while we were victorious we gloried in it. After me there came others, who strove to temper what I had done, whose aim was justice and mercy, the blessed heaven of tolerance and understanding, and then the brotherhood of man rather than the exclusive brotherhood of one tribe of men. But we have not been allowed to forget that we were once a chosen people. Defeated, dispersed, persecuted, we have paid bitterly and long after our time. We have done enough penance. We desired to forget that we were ever a military people; we cultivated all the ways of peace; we forgot the practice of arms. But our path was not made lighter."

"Now, at last, you have come, you and the Germans, and you hunger and strive to be chosen. So be it. For centuries my people have tried to escape the burden of memory of their role, but they had to wait for your coming. As for me, I have made my journey and my long penance is over."

"And now, O Wandering German to be, I leave you."

"Wait, wait," cried Hitler, hurrying to the door as if Joshua had left by that medium. "Let us talk this over. I—"

But he was 40 centuries too late.

INCREASED SECURITY FOR THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL AND THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a joint resolution just introduced by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one week ago the membership of the House was subjected to the tragic shooting from the gallery by fanatical Puerto Ricans who made the trip down from New York in order to murder Members of Congress. It did not make any difference to them whether they were located in the House or in the Senate. Their purpose was to inflict mortal injury upon Members of Congress.

I am tremendously pleased the Members that were injured by the fusillade of bullets which were fired by these terrorists are going to completely recover and will soon again be here with us in this honorable association. Also, I am thankful to God more of the membership were not injured and that none of those who were shot were mortally wounded.

During this week that has passed, I have given tremendous thought to the problem emphasized by this tragic occurrence. By way of conclusion to these thoughts, I have filed today a joint resolution having as its purpose the protection of the Congress of the United States, as well as the United States Capitol and its grounds. It is my view that the recommendations I have suggested in this joint resolution, if adopted by the Congress, would prove to be very effective in accomplishing the desired security for Members of Congress and for the United States Capitol.

It is to be noted that in this resolution of mine, I have made the requirement that no person shall be permitted to enter the Capitol Building unless that person has answered in the negative as to whether or not he is a Communist or a member of the Communist Party.

House Joint Resolution 464

Joint resolution to provide increased security for the United States Capitol and for the Congress

Resolved, etc., That a Board to be known as the Capitol Security Board is hereby created. The Capitol Security Board shall be composed of the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 3 Members of the Senate of the United States to be appointed by the Vice President, 3 Members of the House of Representatives of the United States to be appointed by the Speaker, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms of the House, and the Architect of the Capitol. The Capitol Security Board shall be responsible for the complete security of the United States Capitol Building and grounds, and the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) That an office to be known as the Security Office of the Capitol is hereby created. The Security Office of the Capitol shall be headed by a Security Officer of the Capitol who shall be appointed by, and shall

perform his duties under the supervision of, the Capitol Security Board. There shall be in such office a Deputy Security Officer of the Capitol, two Assistant Security Officers of the Capitol, and such other assistants and employees as may be necessary to enable the Security Officer of the Capitol to carry out his duties under this Act.

(b) The Security Officer of the Capitol, the Deputy Security Officer of the Capitol, and Assistant Security Officers of the Capitol shall be trained in the arts and sciences of security operations.

(c) The Capitol police shall be subject to the authority and control of the Security Officer of the Capitol.

(1) The Capitol police shall be trained in the arts and sciences of police duties and operations.

(2) The Capitol police shall be increased in organization and personnel to adequately care for increased responsibilities.

SEC. 3. (a) The Security Officer of the Capitol shall have the responsibility of controlling the admission of persons to the Capitol Building, to the end that no person shall be admitted to such building who might commit therein any act of violence.

(b) In order to accomplish the objective set forth in the preceding subsection, the Security Officer of the Capitol shall issue regulations providing, among other things, that no person shall be admitted to the Capitol Building unless—

(1) he has a pass duly issued to him by a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, or one of their authorized representatives,

(2) he is an employee of the legislative branch who has been issued a pass by the Security Officer of the Capitol,

(3) he is a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner,

(4) he has been summoned to appear before a committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, or before a joint committee of the Congress, or

(5) he has been given such examination, and has furnished such information as the Security Officer shall require.

SEC. 4. No person shall be issued a pass by the Security Officer of the Capitol as provided in clause (2) of section 3 (b) of this Act, or admitted after examination as provided in clause (5) of section 3 (d) of this Act, until he has been asked whether he is or has ever been a member of the Communist Party of the United States of America, and has answered in the negative, except that this section shall not apply to persons summoned to appear before a committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, or a joint committee of the Congress.

SEC. 5. The Security Officer of the Capitol, the Deputy and Assistant Security Officers shall receive compensation in accord with the prevailing schedule for Federal Government employees. Employees of the Capitol Security Office shall be subject to the rules and regulations adopted by the Capitol Security Board.

SEC. 6. The Capitol Police Board is hereby abolished.

THE MEXICAN LABOR BILL

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House, to revise and extend my remarks and include a news article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today the Mexican farm labor bill was being considered in the House. A week ago tomorrow the final vote was taken. The following day, on Wednesday, March 3, the bill passed the Senate

and on the following day, Thursday, March 4, the bill was again considered in the House and an amendment by the Senate was agreed to and the bill was sent on to the President for his signature. I understand that the bill is now on the President's desk.

At the time the resolution was first presented to the House Committee on Agriculture I objected to its consideration for many reasons. The first and most important reason was that I believed that such a resolution would be incompatible with the good-neighbor policy of our Government and I was convinced that the passage of the resolution would have far-reaching international implications. I further thought that the resolution was calculated to embarrass the officials of our own Government. I did not believe at that time that an effort in good faith had been made to compose the differences between the two governments regarding the international agreement which is definitely contemplated by existing law. These were but a few of my objections to House Joint Resolution 355. At the time I interposed my first objection and insisted upon delaying indefinitely the consideration of the measure I took the position that negotiations should be resumed in the hope that an agreement satisfactory to both governments might soon be reached.

After I had insisted upon open public hearings and after I had communicated with officials of our own Government and with the Mexican Ambassador to Washington and with the White House and was advised that the President of the United States had expressed the hope that negotiations might be resumed immediately, negotiations were resumed in Mexico City that very night. From that time forward great progress has been made. I am now advised that all matters and things in controversy have been composed and that only the drafting of the details of the provisions of the contract remain to be worked out. I understand that the language difficulties will soon be resolved and finally agreed upon. I asked for only a few weeks and at last for only a week or two in which I thought that an agreement might be reached. I stated before the Rules Committee that I did not believe that the President could very gracefully sign and approve House Joint Resolution 355 especially in view of the fact that he had caused negotiations to be resumed on the night of February 10, 1954. The President is at the present time apparently experiencing some difficulties in determining whether or not he should approve the measure.

I take the floor at this time, Mr. Speaker, to express the hope that the President will not sign and approve House Joint Resolution 355 which is generally known as the Mexican farm-labor bill. If he will withhold signing for perhaps a few more hours an agreement will probably be reached and it will not then be necessary for him to sign or to approve the measure.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I sincerely hope that the President will hold up the signing of the bill, and if the agreement is

entered into that he will not sign it. As a matter of fact, I hope he will not sign the bill because, like the gentleman from North Carolina, I opposed it because of the serious and unfortunate results that might develop as a result of the passage of the bill, so far as it would affect our friendly relations with our neighbors to the south. And particularly in the light of the information which is now available. I hope that the course will be one which will be consistent with strengthening the friendship between the United States and Mexico rather than the creation of tension between the two countries which is unnecessary.

Mr. COOLEY. I appreciate the observations of my distinguished friend from Massachusetts and agree entirely with the sentiment he has expressed.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a news article which I understand appeared in the San Diego Union on Saturday morning, March 6. The byline is by Frank Macomber and the date line is Washington, March 5.

ENTIRE WETBACK PICTURE SNAFUED AGAIN (By Frank Macomber)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—United States negotiators at Mexico City have agreed to toss border recruiting of Mexican farm workers out of a new international program in exchange for other concessions from the Mexican Government, California Congressmen were told today by the State Department.

An international commission meanwhile will be created to study the question of whether border recruiting should be made a provision of an international agreement, Department officials told the Congressmen.

A new international agreement is due to be signed perhaps as early as Monday. The Department's admission that its negotiators had given way on the controversial border recruiting issue came as a shock to Congressmen who have fought for weeks to put through the House and Senate a bill legalizing United States border recruiting of Mexican farm workers without Mexico's participation.

Its primary aim was to give United States negotiators, headed by American Ambassador Francis White, a strong hand in insisting on border recruiting for farmers close to the international boundary in San Diego and Imperial Counties of southern California and in a half-dozen Texas border farming areas.

The border recruiting bill only reached the President's desk today, after a stormy trip through the House and Senate.

Representatives JOHN PHILLIPS, BOB WILSON, and JAMES B. UTT, Republican of California, first got wind of a report that the United States was about to sign a pact with Mexico without a border recruiting provision.

They went into a huddle with Vice President NIXON and Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican of California. The State Department and the White House were called and the report was confirmed.

Then Speaker JOSEPH MARTIN, Republican of Massachusetts, and Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, Republican of Indiana, House majority leader, were brought into the huddle. The GOP congressional leaders were asked to take up the border recruiting issue Monday with the President at their regular weekly legislative huddle.

KNOWLAND said it would be the first order of business at the White House Monday.

The California Congressmen want the President to order the United States to hold up agreement on the new international farm labor agreement until some border recruiting provision is inserted.

State Department officials explained to the legislators they gave way on this issue, side-tracking it to a proposed international

study commission, as a trade for Mexican concessions.

But UTT, WILSON, and PHILLIPS charged the United States negotiators gave away the most important provision from the viewpoint of the United States farmer close to the border, in exchange for concession on far less vital provisions.

The Congressmen said they understood, too, that United States negotiators agreed to an informal understanding there would be no further United States operated border recruiting program during the life of the new international agreement.

UTT, WILSON, and PHILLIPS told the congressional leaders they should insist on at least 20 percent border recruiting—that is, of 200,000 Mexican farm laborers brought into this country each year, at least 40,000 should be recruited from the border area and the rest from the interior.

UTT, WILSON, and PHILLIPS, who spent all afternoon conferring with congressional leader on the new complication in an already complicated Mexican farm labor picture, charged that the State Department's concession on the border recruiting issue makes Congress look foolish.

"We have been fighting for weeks to get this border recruiting bill through the House and Senate, to give our negotiators backing in Mexico City," UTT recalled. "Now that the bill is about to become law and can be used as a valuable weapon in the negotiations, the State Department gives way on the one issue we have insisted upon—some border recruiting for southern California and Texas farmers."

UTT, WILSON, and PHILLIPS warned that the border recruiting program was sold to Congress on the claim that it would be the best possible way to combat the penetration of Mexican wetbacks into this country. In the last few weeks, they pointed out, since border recruiting was in effect, immigration border patrolmen have raided 110 border area farms and picked up only 10 wetbacks. Before border recruiting the raiding of 110 farms usually netted about 1,000 wetbacks, they pointed out.

The proposed United States-Mexican Commission to study border recruiting and other issues still in dispute will be a part of the new agreement as it presently is drafted, State Department officials told the Congressmen.

Rocco Siciliano, in testimony before a House Appropriations Subcommittee Wednesday but made public today, said the United States and Mexico likely will be ready to sign a new farm labor agreement by Monday.

Testimony taken at the hastily called Wednesday hearing was released as the House Appropriations Committee approved a special bill providing \$478,000 to finance the Mexican farm labor program until June 30, end of the present fiscal year.

Chairman FRED BUSHEY (Republican of Illinois) of the Appropriations Subcommittee which held hearings on the Labor Department's request for the funds, emphasized the money may be spent either on a United States border recruiting setup, without Mexico's participation, or for an international program with Mexico.

State Department officials said United States negotiators are near agreement with Mexico on an international farm labor pact but said there was no assurance negotiations have been concluded and await only the signatures of both nations.

"There often is much give and take in the editing and interpretation of a final draft of an international agreement, and it would be premature to say final agreement has been reached," an official State Department spokesman said.

Labor Department officials have credited the border recruiting issue with being a potent weapon which helped to bring United States-Mexican negotiations close to agreement on a new international program.

Siciliano said Mexico now has agreed that the United States Labor Secretary will determine the prevailing wage rates on which pay of Mexican farmworkers will be based. This was a serious point of dispute which held up agreement for weeks.

Mexico also has recognized worker responsibility and the need for United States employers to withhold some wages as assurance Mexican employees won't leave the job before their contract ends, Siciliano said.

The United States has compromised with Mexico on establishment of subsistence rates for Mexican workers, insisting that the United States Labor Secretary set this amount but allowing Mexico to investigate if it believes the rate is incorrect, the Assistant Secretary added.

Negotiators have agreed, he testified, to the Joint Commission, possibly to be comprised of two members from each Government, to investigate such still disputed issues as—

1. Whether border recruiting stations for farmworkers shall be set up just inside the Mexican side of the border or on the American side, as under the unilateral recruiting setup.

2. A United States farmers' proposal that the minimum contract time be reduced from 6 to 4 weeks, making it easier for border-area growers to hire contract Mexican labor. They have complained that 6 weeks is too long a contract period.

Siciliano said the Commission also might investigate the so-called Mexican wetback traffic along the border, to determine its causes. But he did not elaborate.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

THE SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VAN PELT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

MR. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Republican Party. This significant event, which changed the history of this Nation, took place in Ripon, Wis., which is in the district I have the honor to represent in the Congress.

For a brief moment, Mr. Speaker, permit me to conjure up a picture of the scene that occurred the evening of March 20, 1854. It was a cold, bleak night, and the word had just reached the Midwest of the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill by the United States Senate. This was the call to arms for a determined band of antislavery Whig, Democrats, and Free Soilers. They had been discussing the issue for months, and had decided to form a new political party if steps were taken to extend slavery into the Territories of the West.

Maj. Alan E. Bovay, of Ripon, had suggested the name of Republican for this new party. It was at his call that the small group assembled in the candlelit white schoolhouse and, huddled around a brightly flaming wood fire, launched the new party which, in 1860, elected the immortal Lincoln to the Presidency.

The white schoolhouse still stands at Ripon, the symbol of a mighty political force in this Nation. The citizens of that community are preparing to observe the birth of the party with a great centennial celebration starting on March 20. Hon. Leonard Hall, chairman of the National Republican Com-

mittee, will be the speaker on that occasion. It is hoped that President Eisenhower will pull the switch lighting a new freedom flame at the spot where the party was born 100 years ago. Later in the year Vice President RICHARD NIXON will visit Ripon.

I have been asked by Mr. William A. Royce, Jr., cochairman of the celebration committee, to extend an invitation to the Members of the Congress to join in this pilgrimage. Complete particulars regarding the program will be available in my office.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to extend my remarks and include at this point a documented statement on the origin of the Republican Party. This authentic version was prepared by the late James H. Davidson, who served in this Congress from 1897 to 1913. The statement follows:

ORIGIN OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The Republican Party of the United States originated, both as to organization and name in the town of Ripon, this county. "One of the earliest, if not the earliest, of the movements," says Henry Wilson, "that contemplated definite action and the formation of a new party, was made in Ripon, Fond du Lac County, Wis., in the early months of 1854. In consequence of a very thorough canvass, conference and general comparison of views, inaugurated by A. E. Bovay (Alan E. Bovay), a prominent member of the Whig Party, among the Whigs, Free Soilers, and Democrats of that township, a call was issued . . . for a public meeting to consider the grave issues which were assuming an aspect of such alarming importance. The meeting was held on the last (day) of February, in the Congregational Church. It was largely attended by persons of both sexes from the town and surrounding country. It was a meeting solely for the discussion of principles and comparison of views. . . . The burden and drift of the speeches were the hopeless subservency of the national parties to the behests of the slaveholders, the necessity of abandoning them, and the proposed policy of constructing a party from the materials thus set at liberty, with such as could be persuaded to leave the Democratic Party for a similar purpose. A resolution was adopted that, if the Nebraska bill, then pending, should pass, they would "throw old party organizations to the winds, and organize a new party on the sole issue of the non-extension of slavery."

"A second meeting was held," continues Mr. Wilson, "on the 20th of March, for the purpose of organization and for the adoption of such preliminary measures as the inauguration of the new party required. By formal vote, the town committees of the Whig and Free Soil Parties were dissolved, and a committee of 5, consisting of 3 Whigs, 1 Free Soiler, and 1 Democrat, was chosen. "The work done on that evening," says Mr. Bovay, "was fully accepted by the Whig and Free Soil Parties of all this section immediately, and very soon—that is to say, in a few months—by these parties throughout the entire State." A State convention was held in July, by which the organization of the party was perfected for the State, a majority of the delegation was secured for the next Congress; and a Free Soiler, Charles Durkee, was elected to the Senate of the United States. At the meeting of the 20th of March, Mr. Bovay, though stating his belief that the party should and probably would take the name of 'Republican,' advised against such a christening at that time, and by that small local body of men. He, however, wrote to the editor of the New York Tribune, suggesting the name, giving his reasons therefor, and requesting him, if

his views corresponded with his own, to call the attention of his readers to it in the columns of his paper. Thus early did the men of that frontier town inaugurate a movement which was destined to sweep and control the Nation, and which did sweep the country, and change entirely the policy of the Government."

Careful investigations in the city of Ripon more than confirm the opinion of the late Vice President of the United States—Mr. Wilson. Facts have been brought from original sources—from living witnesses—from documentary evidence—all bearing upon this interesting and important movement, and all prove beyond question that Alan E. Bovay first suggested the formation and name of the political party of the United States known as the Republican Party; that several of his neighbors whose names are hereafter given powerfully aided him in its first organization in Ripon—cordially cooperating with him in the inauguration of the new party.

Says Major Bovay:

"I had been a Whig, but the Whig Party was then dead. Its defunct condition was not generally realized, but it was dead nevertheless. It had been routed horse, foot, and artillery in the fall of 1852. That battle was its Waterloo." No party could outlive such a terrible slaughter of its innocents as that was.

"True, up to the spring of 1854, it still held on to its organization. But it was a mere shell; a skeleton army, nothing more.

"The leaders could not marshal their troops; could not anywhere bring their forces into line; in short, the party was dead, though not dissolved. Moreover, the country no longer took any interest in the old Whig issues. The slavery question dominated everything else. Nobody talked or thought any longer about protection to American industry. It was slavery in the States, slavery in the Territories, the fugitive slave law, and the refrain was ever slavery, and nothing else. There was one great, overshadowing, proslavery party—the Democratic; there must also be one great antislavery party to antagonize it. The logic of history demanded it. Such a party had become inevitable. The Whig Party was not this party, and could not be. It had outstayed its time and its usefulness; it was an anachronism. It had become an obstruction, an impediment, a nuisance. But how to get the organization out of the way—that was a rather formidable question. It stood there a great, useless, lifeless thing, awaiting some possible political earthquake, which would be violent enough to shake it to pieces. And the earthquake came.

"The triumph of slavery had been so complete in the slaughter of 1852, that its cohorts thought themselves strong enough to do anything, so they laid their hands on the oldest and most sacred of the compromises. The shock was tremendous. Instantly the whole North was in a flame of indignation and rage. The hour had struck. This was the tempest that was to sweep from our sight not only the Whig organization, but also all those little fragments of parties, Free Soil and the like, that had grown out of the slavery agitation in years that were past. The time had come for all liberty-loving Whigs to dismantle their house. As for me, I did not propose to wait for the passage of the Nebraska bill. It was foreordained to pass; then why wait? I felt 'in my bones,' as old Candace said, that the righteous rage of the time ought to be turned to some permanent account, and not permitted to effervesce in useless foam. I set to work in the most systematic way that I could contrive, to dissolve the Whig Party and to organize the Republican Party right here, fully convinced that others would do the like elsewhere, and, that in a few months we should have a great, irresistible northern party, organized on the single issue of the nonextension of slavery.

"This is the point at which the late Vice President takes notice of our movement. His history is very brief, but substantially correct. Jehdiah Bowen was my chief helper; a merchant of high standing, a man of intelligence, position, and influence, his assistance was of the utmost importance. One part of the work was specially difficult. All the people, except the most hardened Democrats, responded to my appeals with the utmost avidity, up to a certain limit. They said, 'Oh, yes; oh, yes, we are with you in denouncing this thing. It is a great outrage; it is a swindle; we will protest; we will resolve; we will sign all the remonstrances you can think of.'

"But—and just here came the pinch—a good many of the old Whigs begged hard for the Whig Party. 'Spare the party; spare the party. Let all the outside elements come to us; our party is good enough; we will fight the democracy on this ground; we will triumph.' The good souls; they had to be told squarely that the 'Whig Party must go'; that the very heart and core of our movement was that to which they could not agree. To let the Whig Party stay was to insure permanent power to the Democratic Party. To retreat from the formation of a new party was to surrender to the slave power. They came to the meetings, and were respectfully heard, but the large majority had made up their minds. The hour was late, the candles burned low; it was a cold, windy night at the vernal equinox. In the end, all but 2 or 3 gave in, and we formed our organization.

"I remember every word and act, as if the time was but yesterday. The election of that first Republican committee—A. E. Bovay, Jehdiah Bowen, Amos Loper, Jacob Woodruff, and Abraham Thomas—was a solemn act. Every man present fully believed that he was helping to make a permanent piece of history. And he was. Yes; that point ought to be clearly understood. This was no blind, unconscious movement, of which the human family make so many. We did not build better than we knew, as some have supposed; we built precisely as we knew; and there stands the edifice. Look at it. It will bear examination. It was no fragmentary movement. It contemplated the combination of all shades of antislavery sentiment in the country in one grand organization to resist the encroachments of slavery, under the name 'Republican.'

"The name was as well settled in my mind as the organization, and I took what seemed to me the most effectual course to secure its general adoption. Republican; the common weal; an old and cherished name in our own political history, and the name which is owned, as theirs, by all liberal men and liberal organizations throughout the world. The adoption of this name was as much inevitable as was the nomination of Abraham Lincoln in 1860. In both of these cases, a wise choice meant success, and an unwise one meant defeat; no more, no less. That I was advocating this name for the great party which I saw looming in the near future above the horizon, as far back as the autumn of 1852, there is abundant evidence.

"Were Horace Greeley living, I could readily convince anyone that I was contemplating this identical state of things in the political world, name, organization and all, as early even as May 1852; but, as Mr. Greeley's testimony is not now attainable, and I have but one living witness to this latter fact (which witness I do not choose to call), I must rest upon the autumn of 1852.

"And perhaps the autumn will do as well as the spring. That gives Ripon a precedence of nearly 2 years (or, to be exact, 19 months) in the matter of the name; for it was not until June 1854, that the name 'Republican' was adopted formally, and that was by the State convention of Michigan.

"I take pleasure in referring to one of our oldest and most prominent citizens, Judge

E. L. Runals, who took no part in the movement, but was cognizant of it all. This is his testimony:

"RIPON, December 16, 1879.

"To Maj. A. E. BOVAY, Ripon, Wis.

"DEAR SIR: I remember well a conversation I had with you in the fall of 1852, not more than 2 or 3 weeks, I should think, after the election of Franklin Pierce to Presidency, in relation to the political affairs of the country. You, in substance, said that the Whig party, to which you belonged, could not survive such an overwhelming defeat as it had just suffered; that it could never rally again; that it would have to abandon its organization and its name; that the country had ceased to care for the old Whig issues; that slavery had become the all-absorbing question; that on some phase of this question a new party would probably soon be formed at the North, which would combine the Whigs, Free-Soilers, and all the outside elements against the Democracy, which was the great pillar and support of slavery; that the selection of a name would be an object of the first importance to this new party; and that, in your opinion, it should be called the "Republican" party. You also gave your reasons at considerable length for so thinking;

"You said that as this was the name by which the party of Jefferson had been called from its foundation up to Jackson's time, it would possess a charm, by reason of these old associations, for all Americans, and that it would be attractive to men of foreign birth by reason of its general use amongst the liberals of Europe—and much more to the same effect. Having known you in politics as a Whig, I was rather surprised at these predictions as coming from you, and it is probably owing to this fact that they made so firm an impression on my mind.

"Yours very truly,

"E. L. RUNALS."

On the 25th day of January 1854, Jeremiah Bowen, then (as now) a citizen of Ripon—a Democrat with Free-Soil proclivities—caused to be published in the Ripon Herald, a Democratic paper, the following communication:

"MR. EDITOR: Nothing indicates more clearly the truth of these words of Jefferson's—"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty"—than the course pursued in Congress by the committee to which was referred the call from Nebraska for a Territorial Government.

"It is well known that the Territory is intended to be bounded on the south, at farthest, by the old Missouri Compromise line of 36° and 30' north latitude. It is a portion of that vast territory ceded to the United States by its treaty with France, by which the present State of Louisiana was secured to us. It is a portion of that territory which, by the act known as the Missouri Compromise, was to be forever free from the introduction of slavery or involuntary servitude, except in punishment of crimes.

"Mark, then, the appropriateness of Jefferson's maxim, when we find that Senator Douglas, as head of the above-mentioned committee, reported a bill for a Territorial Government, in which is a clause prospectively annulling that clause of the Missouri Compromise Act, mentioned above, relating to slavery in that Territory. Douglas' bill provides that should any portion of the Territory, upon application to Congress for admission into the Union as a State (have permitted involuntary servitude, it) shall not be rejected by reason of the establishment of slavery therein, by virtue of its constitution.

"One might think from the wallings and threats of the Southern press and politicians, and the echoes by their servile friends at the North, that peace was all that they demand for their peculiar institution; but it is not so; not satisfied with the triumph obtained over the North by the passage of the most odious law that encumbers the

statute books of any Christian nation, they now demand that they shall not only enjoy in peace their favorite slavery at home, and its further security under the fugitive slave law, but that the whole country shall submit to the extension of slavery into territory, which, by right and solemn compact, has been consecrated to liberty.

"What do our great men do in view of this demand? Do they not indignantly frown upon such barefaced impudence? Surely one might expect to learn, that at least the Representatives of States free from the incubus of slavery would protest against so glaring a wrong to our honor and to humanity. But what do we see? One of the highest in our national councils—the chief leader of the 'Young Democracy'—one who aspires to the chief magistracy of this great Nation, bending, cringing, licking the dust at the very feet of this Moloch—groveling in the mire before it, to gather the withered laurels cast away from the Nation's brow by reason of this insatiate monster. Is there no shame left, that a man pretending to represent a free State should thus so degrade his constituents and humanity itself? 'Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad.' It cannot be otherwise than that these men, pandering to the worst sins of a people to obtain an ephemeral fame, are deluded by their own depravity to their own ruin; God forbid that it be the Nation. Can it be supposed that the cry of 'down with agitation and agitators,' will avail in the face of so gross an offense as is here offered to a people awakening to the inconsistencies and oppression of slavery?"

"So long as Senator Douglas, or any other man, shall defend what, by compact and right, pertains to the slave States, as such, we would not refuse to him his just meed of honor; but when he stoops so low as to bend the knee of slavery and to discard the approbation of freemen, let no lover of his country's honor fail to point the finger of scorn at him, and indignantly blot his name from the list of our country's friends."

This communication was published over the signature "X" but Mr. Bowen was not at all disposed to deny its paternity, notwithstanding his affiliation with the Democratic Party; he was not adverse to being classed among anti-Nebraska Democrats. The editor of the Ripon Herald in his issue of February 1, in commenting upon Bowen's article, said: "We inserted in our last a communication over the signature 'X' upon the subject of Senator Douglas' Nebraska bill, passing severe strictures upon the Senate (Senator) and his bill. We should then have said that we were not prepared to indorse the grounds taken by 'X'. For ourselves, we will say that we measure much of our political creed by the doctrine of State rights."

"A few days (perhaps a week) after the appearance of the article containing some strictures upon the course of Senator Douglas, in the Ripon Herald of January 25, 1854, I was called upon by A. E. Bovay, who requested an interview, if I could spare the time, to talk over the subject of that article and what ought to be done in furtherance of its purposes."

"As Mr. Bovay had widely differed with me on some of the political questions that had been under discussion during the 3 years of our acquaintance, he expressed some surprise and gratification at the publication of the sentiment contained in the article by me, and yet, as I thought then, not without some doubt as to my earnestness. However, he soon became convinced on that point. We talked for some time upon the probabilities of the future, in view of the excitement caused by the advocacy by Senator Douglas of the Kansas and Nebraska Act, for there seemed to be no adequate power to oppose his measure successfully, the Whig Party being as much divided in Congress as the Democrats. We argued that the only hope of defeating the extension of slavery, lay in the

outspoken sentiment of the people, irrespective of existing parties. Then came the proposition of Mr. Bovay, to endeavor to crystallize public feeling by calling a meeting to discuss the question of organizing a new party. I hesitated; my faith was not strong that we could effect the object. I represented the sparseness of our population; we were in a small rural village, remote even from the county seat, and upon no great line of travel; could we make ourselves heard by the public at large? To this, Mr. Bovay replied, that there would be no question about it. The conclusion was that we should try it. Then followed the question of method of proceeding and the name by which to call the party—which Mr. Bovay suggested. Some estimates were attempted to be made as to what would be the relative proportion of the two parties who would give in their adherence to the new party. We agreed in the main, as to the classes of men that we had hopes of. We went to the house of Amos Loper, living some 3 miles north of the village, laid the matter before him in all its bearings, Mr. Bovay taking the lead in the conversation. Mr. Loper was not long in making up his mind, and we agreed to make a call for a meeting, to be held at the Congregational Church, on the last day of February.

"I cannot recall the exact language used by either of us. The subject occupied all our thoughts. We looked upon the movement as of considerable importance in a personal point of view, touching our relations with the citizens; for, to make a move and fail, would probably bring obloquy, and I was not prepared financially to court such a state of things; but, concluding that we were in the line of duty, it was undertaken in a hopeful and cheerful spirit. We were afterward astonished at the progress made, and watched with intense interest the spread of the movement through all the Northern States."

The call spoken of by Mr. Bowen was drawn up and printed in the Ripon Herald on the 29th of February.

The moderator of the meeting was William Dunham; W. N. Martin was secretary. The burden and drift of the speeches were, as Mr. Wilson truthfully says, "the hopeless subservency of the national parties to the behests of the slaveholders, the necessity of abandoning them, and the proposed policy of constructing a party from the materials thus set at liberty."

The following preamble and resolutions were freely discussed and unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the Senate of the United States is entertaining, and from present indications is likely to pass, bills organizing governments for the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, in which is embodied a clause repealing the Missouri Compromise Act, and so admit into these Territories the slave system with all its evils; and, whereas, we deem that compact irrepealable as to the Constitution itself: Therefore

"Resolved, That of all outrages hitherto perpetrated or attempted upon the North and freedom by the slaveholders and their natural allies, not one compares in bold and impudent audacity, treachery, and meanness with this, the Nebraska bill, as to the sum of all its other villainies it adds the repudiation of a solemn compact held as sacred as the Constitution itself for the period of 34 years;

"Resolved, That the Northern man who can aid and abet in commission of so stupendous a crime, is none too good to become an accomplice in renewing the African slave trade, the service which, doubtless, will next be required of him by his Southern masters, should the Nebraska treason succeed;

"Resolved, That the attempt to overthrow the Missouri Compromise, whether successful or not, admonishes the North to adopt the maxim for all time to come, 'No more compromise with slavery';

"Resolved, That the passage of this bill (if pass it should) will be the call to arms of a great northern party, such an one as the country has not hitherto seen, composed of Whigs, Democrats, and Free-Soilers; every man with a heart in him united under the single banner cry of 'Repeal! Repeal!'

"Resolved, That the small but compact phalanx of true men, who oppose the mad scheme upon the broadest principle of humanity, as well as their unflinching efforts to uphold public faith, deserve not only our applause, but our profound esteem;

"Resolved, That the heroic attitude of General Houston, amidst a host of degenerate men in the United States Senate, is worthy of honor and applause."

Then and there was born the Republican Party of the United States; the time was the evening of the last day of February 1854; the place, the frame Congregational Church, which is still standing in the city of Ripon.

On the 18th of March the following call was printed in the Ripon Herald:

"THE NEBRASKA BILL

"A bill expressly intended to extend and strengthen the institution of slavery has passed the Senate by a very large majority, many northern Senators voting for it, and many more sitting in their seats and not voting at all. It is evidently destined to pass the House and become a law unless its progress is arrested by the general uprising of the North against it.

"Therefore we, the undersigned, believing this community to be nearly or quite unanimous in opposition to the nefarious scheme, would call a public meeting of citizens of all parties to be held at the schoolhouse in Ripon on Monday evening, March 20, at 6:30 o'clock, to resolve, to petition, and to organize against it.

"J. BOWEN,

"A. LOPER,

"T. L. REYNOLDS,

"A. E. BOVAY,

"(And 50 others)."

The 54 citizens—Whigs, Democrats, and Free-Soilers—who signed the call, understood perfectly that, in so doing, they were pledging themselves to join the new party. It will be remembered that Mr. Wilson says of the meeting which followed, that "by formal vote, the town committees of the Whig and Free-Soil Parties were dissolved, and a committee of 5, consisting of 3 Whigs, 1 Free-Soiler, and 1 Democrat, was chosen." A. E. Bovay, J. Bowen, Amos Loper, Abram Thomas, and Jacob Woodruff constituted the committee. Then and there the Republican Party of the United States was christened, and these men were its godfathers. "The actors in this remote little eddy of politics," afterward wrote Mr. Bovay, "thought at the time that they were making a bit of history by that solitary tallow candle, in the little white schoolhouse on the prairie; and whether ever recognized and published or not, they think so still."

TAXPAYER, BEWARE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, when the President talked late last year and early in January about the kind of legislative program he was going to send up here for enactment, he said it was going to be dynamic and progressive.

I do not intend at this time to take up the entire program in any detail but I would like to address my remarks for a

few minutes to one extremely important part of it—the tax bill.

The revenue revision bill of 1954, which will shortly come before the House after many, many weeks of exhausting and frustrating study in the Ways and Means Committee, is certainly not progressive in any sense of the word. Nor is it dynamic. Rather, I would term it, dynamite.

The bill itself is big enough to choke an elephant. But it will be mighty palatable to those millionaires who have been most active over the years in supporting the GOP elephant. They will get back their assistance many times over if this bill becomes law in its present form.

But the average taxpayer will get nothing. In fact, he will get worse than nothing—he will find in this bill the seeds of higher tax obligations for him in the future.

His Federal taxes will ultimately have to go up if this bill passes. His State taxes will go up. His local taxes will go up. He is going to take a beating. And so I say, Mr. Speaker, "Taxpayer, beware." This bill is a fiscal killer.

I have told the House on many occasions—so many that I have become self-conscious about boring any among us who may have such closed minds they do not want the facts or the truth—about the booby traps and pitfalls and gimmicks and loopholes written into this bill, provisions intended to benefit big business and the wealthy at the expense of the rest of the citizens of the United States.

Today I want to call attention once again to the provision dealing with the falsely named, completely misleading subject of "double taxation of dividends," but I am directing my remarks not to the patent unfairness of this provision as it benefits stockholders to the disadvantage of everyone else, but rather to its broad range implications to the whole economy.

The bill, as Members know, sets up a special category of income—dividends from common stocks—which is to be treated under the tax laws as if it had divine origin—as if anyone who receives income from stocks is so much better than workingmen or other taxpayers that they should get special handouts in the form of special tax deductions and exemptions. As this provision originally stood in the bill, with the support of the majority members of the committee, it would have allowed an investor receiving \$12,000 in dividends a year to get off with a Federal income tax of \$10 whereas the man who earned the same amount of money by working would pay \$1,836. Think of that.

The disparity here was so glaring, so preposterously unfair, and so indefensible that eventually the committee majority reconsidered and toned it down a bit and now the stockholder will not do quite as well as that, but he will still do very well, thank you, in comparison with those who earn their incomes or receive it through means other than possession of common stocks paying dividends.

Now, instead of having 5 or 10 or 15 percent—by the third year—of his dividend income deducted from the amount

of the tax he owes—the most outlandish idea I ever heard of for a handout to the wealthy—he will now have 5 or 10 percent of the tax on that dividend income deducted from his tax bill. It is still a tremendous handout, a tremendous tax immunity bath for the well-to-do.

Believe me, Mr. Speaker, I do not today want to bore any of the Members who might look on this largess with unconcern. I have spoken often of the unfairness of this provision and I think I have made that point if it can be made at all. But let us look at the implications of this thing from another standpoint—let us look at it in cold-blooded fiscal or banker's terms rather than in terms of fairness or unfairness or right or wrong. Let us examine what it would do to the investment market—and I am sure every Member is interested in that.

This provision is intended to make common stocks more attractive to investors. If it had been written on the floor of the New York Stock Exchange or in the office of the board of governors of the exchange, it could not have been better timed or better written to promote the present drive of the stockbrokers to get more people to buy common stocks, even on the installment plan, \$40 a month.

I have no objection to the stockbrokers trying to get more customers. At present, only about 4 out of 100 persons are owners of stocks. At present, only about 1 family out of 10 owns stocks. At present, only 1 out of 16 adults owns stocks. The more people who buy and sell stocks, the more commissions the brokers make, and that is their livelihood, and I have no objection to them making a living or promoting their business.

But this provision is intended to encourage stockbuying and stockholding by making common stocks more attractive from an income tax standpoint than other types of securities.

As stocks become more attractive, bonds usually lose out. So the interest rates on bonds must rise in order better to compete with stocks for investors' money. What happens when bond interest rates go up?

Borough and township, city and county, and State and Federal costs go up, because the officials of these public agencies must bid higher and higher for investors' dollars in order to compete with common stocks. That is perfectly normal.

What we are doing in this tax bill, however, is taking sides in the battle, deliberately extending tax advantages to common stocks which will react adversely to the bond market and force higher interest rates on municipal bonds, on State bonds, on Federal bonds—and do not forget we have got a \$275 billion debt to fund—and on mortgages, railroad equipment bonds, corporation bonds, and every other type of security which competes with common stocks for investment funds.

Who pays the higher interest rates? In the last analysis the taxpayer—and at every level of Government.

Shades of the late but lamented hard-money policy—the monumental blunder of the Treasury last year which had much to do with today's economic dislocations. Now we are going back once

again to the hard-money, high-interest policy, only this time we are going it through the medium of a tax bill to give common stocks an unnecessary, completely gratuitous, extra and special promotional gimmick, one, which I said earlier, could not have been more sweet and lovely to the stockbrokers in the Exchange if they had written it themselves in Wall Street.

In this time of worldwide military danger from communism, of huge and almost incomprehensible military expenditures for our safety and survival, of a \$275 billion national debt which apparently is going to get bigger before it gets smaller—if it does get any smaller under this administration—and of burdensome direct and indirect taxes at every level of Government on the wage earner and the small-business man, what is there about common stocks which deserves such special largess right now?

Are they depressed? They are not. They are today reaching record levels, perhaps partly in anticipation of the handout momentarily expected from Congress. Are common stocks a poor investment? Obviously not—they have been exceptionally good investments for many years.

I have in my hand a pamphlet issued by one of the Wall Street brokers showing that over the years since the war, common stocks have returned in dividends anywhere from 6 to nearly 8 percent a year on market values. What other investment has done as well year after year? Not savings banks or savings and loan associations, not bonds.

Mark you, Mr. Speaker, I am not referring to earnings—I am referring to dividends. Earnings on common stocks have run anywhere from 11 to 16 percent on stockholder investment through the postwar years. And of this, the corporations' boards have seen fit to return to the stockholders in dividends about half or less of the earnings, plowing the rest back into expansion and improvements which have the effect of strengthening the stockholders' equity and investment. So it is hard to see how stockholders have been suffering in any way from this mislabeled phony, this alleged discrimination euphemistically called double taxation.

For 11 years in a row, aggregate cash dividend payments by listed common stocks topped the total for the preceding 12-month period. So let us have no tears for the poor stockholder; let us look before we leap to the "rescue" of this group of stockholders from a continued fate of 6 and 7 and 8 percent a year on investment in the form of dividends alone, not counting the appreciation in the value of their stockholdings which usually gets taxed at the capital gains rate anyhow.

Let us beware of reinstituting a hard-money policy without realizing what we are doing. Let us not doom the cities of this country to an even more severe jolt on bond funding costs—thus causing an increase in real estate and other local tax rates. Let us not force even higher rates on Government bonds and securities to thus raise our debt costs and hence our tax requirements.

Shall we permit this stock gimmick to go though? Taxpayer, beware.

GATTAS E. MALOOF

Mr. RAY asked and was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Gattas E. Maloof, no adverse report having been made thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HUNTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include certain articles.

Mr. BONIN.

Mr. DEMPSEY.

Mr. KING of California (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK).

Mr. McCORMACK.

Mr. DEWART.

Mr. SPRINGER and to include an editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida to revise and extend his remarks in the Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas to revise and extend his remarks in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to the enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2714. An act to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 9, 1954, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1335. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the 33d Annual Report of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1336. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1337. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of a bill entitled, "A bill to limit the operation of sections 281 and 283 of title 18, United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (5 U. S. C. 99) with respect to counsel in a certain case"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8193. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; without amendment (Rept. No. 1323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. Ninth intermediate report on investigation of racketeering in the Detroit area (Rept. No. 1324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2348. An act to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of red-cedar shingles"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6563. A bill for the relief of Zdzislaw (Jerzy) Jazwinski; with amendment (Rept. No. 1321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 455. Joint resolution granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 8267. A bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 8268. A bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 8269. A bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 8270. A bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 8271. A bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 8272. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in order to provide that revenues under the provisions of such act shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 8273. A bill to authorize the disposal of public lands in the Fort Stanton Marine Hospital Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 8274. A bill to provide for research into cancer and heart disease; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 8275. A bill to postpone tobacco and cigarette tax reductions 2 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 8276. A bill to encourage a stable, prosperous and productive dairy program and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 8277. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEWART:

H. R. 8278. A bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 8279. A bill to reclassify dictaphones in the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 8280. A bill for the relief of the Military Department of the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 463. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that no citizen of the United States shall have the right to vote unless such citizen has reached the age of 21; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 464. Joint resolution providing increased security for the United States Capitol and for the Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature memorializing Congress to continue Federal grants to State relief programs for the aged to preserve the Federal social security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to increasing Federal aid allocations for the highways of the Nation; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to retaining the present formula in allocating Federal-aid funds to the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 8281. A bill for the relief of the estate of William B. Rice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 8282. A bill for the relief of Max Kozlowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 8283. A bill for the relief of Vesma and Gustav Fridenvalds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 8284. A bill for the relief of Fong Bick Sem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 8285. A bill for the relief of Richard Kieve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 8286. A bill to provide for the relief of Milton Beatty and others by providing for determination and settlement of certain claims of former owners of lands and improvements purchased by the United States in connection with the Canyon Ferry Reservoir project, Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 8287. A bill for the relief of Lew F. Bryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

550. By Mr. MASON: Petition of 1,309 civilian employees of the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, Crane, Ind., asking Congress to enact H. R. 6539, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide unemployment insurance for Federal civilian employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

551. By the SPEAKER: Petition of James F. Evans, director of State parks, State of New York, Albany, N. Y., relative to cooperative beach erosion control study of Selkirk Shores

State Park, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

552. Also, petition of Mary F. Parkinson and others, Dunlap, Ill., urging revision of the present 15 and 25 percent rates on Federal excise tax on telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

553. Also, petition of the deputy clerk, Board of Supervisors, County of Erie, Buffalo, N. Y., relative to enactment of necessary legislation so that all individual persons be allowed an exemption of \$1,200 instead of the \$600 now allowed for tax exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

554. Also, petition of the president, M. I. S. Veterans, Honolulu, T. H., urging the immediate admission of the Territory of Hawaii as a State in the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Increase in Personal Income-Tax Exemptions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 8, 1954

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full text of a letter dated February 19, 1954, addressed by me to the President of the United States, urging a \$200 increase in personal income-tax exemptions, in order to increase the buying power and the consumption of goods, as a deterrent to a further decline in business.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 19, 1954,

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The purpose of this letter is to urge you to reconsider your tax proposals in the light of later clarifications in the economic picture. I believe, after careful reflection, that you will agree with me that increasing personal exemptions for income-tax purposes to \$800, and drastic reductions in taxes on consumer goods (excise tax) would be far more just and stabilizing than the current administration proposals which are primarily aimed to stimulate savings through tax reductions to corporations and to the upper income groups.

I hope that, by now, you realize that my attempts during the past 3 months to alert the country on the need to be on guard against depression neither mark me as a prophet of doom and gloom, nor represent any desire to talk the country into a depression. Perhaps it is true that my party would get more votes this fall if the country were to go into a depression. But, it seems obvious that if our motives were selfish and political, the course I would have followed would have been to remain silent and let it happen. I would rather the Democratic Party remain out of power perpetually than to return to power in the wake of the mass misery of a great depression.

So far as my being a prophet is concerned, I have not predicted a depression. But I have, as emphatically as I could, tried to keep our Nation on its toes and ready to act to stop a worsening of the economic picture.

A look at the present economic situation indicates, in my judgment, that the time for action is here. At least we should take some initial effective steps to counteract the downward trend.

The Census Bureau now estimates that there were 3.1 million unemployed in January, or 750,000 more than they had estimated a few weeks before. There is no doubt, therefore, that unemployment has increased markedly in the last few months. In addition the Census figures for January estimated that there were 275,000 "temporarily laid off" who were counted as having a job although they drew no pay and would not have been permitted by their employer to work had they showed up at their former jobs. Employers have also put large numbers on part time in order to spread the work and reduce the payments which they would otherwise have to make to the State unemployment compensation funds. During the month of January the Census estimates that there were 1.9 millions of workers outside of agriculture who actually worked less than 15 hours a week, 1.7 millions from 15 to 21 hours and 1.6 millions from 22 to 29 hours. In all, therefore, 5.2 million workers, or 10 percent of those employed in nonagricultural occupations, worked less than 30 hours a week. Some of this lost time was caused by absenteeism, sickness and voluntary absenteeism from work, but a large proportion was undoubtedly involuntary and caused by the employer putting the workers on part time.

The ratio of farm prices received to prices paid by farmers is hovering at its lowest point in 12 years. Steel production has dropped to only 75 percent of capacity compared with 99 percent a year ago, and is 21 percent below last year in physical volume. Freight car loadings are down 10 percent. Mail order sales are over 13 percent below last year and retail sales have fallen off somewhat. Business failures have risen by almost 50 percent.

While I believe we are in a very definite recession, I still do not predict a depression. We have erected many safety nets during the past 20 years to prevent the bottom from dropping out of the national economy. We have farm price supports, minimum wages, unemployment compensation, collective bargaining, social security, assistance to the needy aged, blind, and dependent children, insured savings deposits, and housing programs, to mention a few of these safeguards. But while they may very well cushion the heaviest impact of a depression such as the one which began 25 years ago, that is about as far as they can go. They, by themselves, will not stop the economy from getting into a tight situation.

Thus, I am urging you, as an immediate step, to alter your tax proposals. I know that you are subjected to tremendous pressures to grant the vast majority of tax relief

to business, investors, and those in the upper income brackets generally. But what is needed as a stabilizing force in the economy is a tax policy to stimulate purchasing power. Increased purchasing power will mean more consumption, sales, services, production, and employment. In short, it will mean more business activity which will do much to reverse the downward trend.

I know it has been argued that stimulants to business and investors are what is needed to keep the economy up. It is argued that by giving such incentives, business will expand production and hence increase employment. But, under such a premise, who will buy the goods? Only adequate monetary purchasing power broadly distributed can do this.

A reduction in taxes to the upper income groups and to corporations would probably stimulate savings. In normal times, savings are converted into investments and give each worker more capital with which to work. This in turn leads to increased productivity and to higher real wages.

But in times such as these while savings may flow into banks, they do not flow out to the same degree in the form of actual investments since businesses are afraid to borrow and banks are afraid to lend. With the large supply of idle industrial equipment on hand, business in general does not want to borrow to add to it. The savings therefore tend to be in large part sterilized and do not expand production and employment as they would in normal times.

To prevent the recession from deepening into a depression, it is, therefore, far better to stimulate consumption than it is savings.

The idea of giving tax relief only to business and investors as a stabilizing force is simply the old "trickle down" theory, or "what's good for business is good for the country." Such policies, followed in the twenties, ended up with the greatest depression this Nation ever had. What is necessary is a "trickle up" theory, or "what's good for the country is good for business." If people have money to buy, business will have markets and persons will have jobs.

The present administration tax proposals, when in full effect, give investors and business 12 times as much relief as individuals. Individuals would get only \$250 million in the form of such items as babysitter allowances and an increase in allowable medical deductions. Recipients of dividends would get \$1.2 billion and businesses would get \$1.8 billion, for a total of nearly \$3 billion.

Yet saying that individuals would get only one-twelfth of the relief given to investors and business is vastly to understate the disparity. Let us analyze this further.

The average individual would get \$6 in tax relief (\$250 million divided by 39 million tax returns showing taxable income), while the average dividend recipient would ultimately get \$200 (\$1.2 billion divided by 6 million